The American Ecclesiastical Review

VOL. CXXVI, No. 3 MARCH, 1952

CONTENTS

The Woman Clothed with the Sun
Bernard J. LeFrois, S.V.D. 161

Easter Eve. Part I *Philip T. Weller* 181

The Need of Knowledge of Faith *Francis J. Connell, C.SS.R.* 195

Lightning Strikes Twice *Peter J. Rahill* 204

A Quest of Thoughts. Part III *John K. Ryan* 208

Further Reminiscences of Money Reform
John F. Cronin, S.S. 213

Interrogation of the Woman Party in the *Super Rato* Process. Part II *John R. Schmidt* 217

ANSWERS TO QUESTIONS

The Problem of a National Lottery 228

Confirmation of a Non-Catholic 228

The Endurance of Precepts in a Religious Order 230

Washing the Celebrant's Hands 231

Missa recitata 232

(Contents Continued on Next Page)

Published monthly by The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C. Subscription price in U. S. currency or equivalent: United States, Canada, $5.00; Foreign, $5.00; 50 cents per copy.

Entered as second class matter, November 30, 1944, at the Post Office at Washington, D. C., under the Act of March 3, 1879. Accepted for mailing at the special rate of postage provided for under Act of March 5, 1930, under Act of February 28, 1925.

Business communications, including subscriptions and changes of address, should be addressed to The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America Press, Washington 17, D. C.

Please address all manuscripts and editorial correspondence to The Editor, The American Ecclesiastical Review, The Catholic University of America, Washington, D. C.

Copyright 1952, by The Catholic University of America Press

(*Contents Continued from Previous Page*)

One Server for Two Masses 232
Purifying the Communion Plate 232
Loss of Consecration or Blessing 233
The *Custodia* 233
A Rosary Medal 233
Distribution of Holy Communion by a Deacon 234
Wearing the Mitre during the Singing of "*et incarnatus est*" 234
Preaching in *Ferraiolo* 234
Mixed Marriages in Church 235

BOOK REVIEWS

Fifty Years of the American Novel, *edited by H. C. Gardiner, S.J.* 236
Father Paul of Graymoor, *by David Gannon, S.A.* 237

EVERY CATHOLIC SCHOOL where HISTORY is taught
EVERY CATHOLIC LIBRARY
EVERY PRIEST
EVERY CATHOLIC interested in HISTORY

should be a regular subscriber to

The Catholic Historical Review

Official Organ of the American Catholic Historical Association

ARTICLES BY LEADING SCHOLARS HISTORICAL MISCELLANY
BOOK REVIEWS NOTES AND COMMENTS PERIODICAL LITERATURE

Recognized as the leading publication in its field. Published quarterly: January, April, July, October. Subscription rate: $5.00; single number $1.50.

Address:

THE CATHOLIC UNIVERSITY OF AMERICA PRESS
Washington 17, D. C.

THE WOMAN CLOTHED WITH THE SUN

A gem is not appreciated until it is dug out and polished. The twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse is such a gem. In the past dozen years a great increase of interest and study has been devoted to it.[1] This interest sprang both from the endeavor to ascertain the evidence of Holy Writ for the dogma of the Assumption of the Blessed Mother,[2] and to a great extent from the present day study of Mariology in general. Our problem is to identify the Woman and to find out the meaning of the chapter.

LITERARY STRUCTURE AND CONTENT OF THE VISION

Even from a literary point of view, the twelfth chapter of the Apocalypse has artistic balance and beauty. It is like a drama in three acts, with the action moving swiftly. The eighteen verses of

[1] G. M. Perrella, C.M., "Sensu mariolog. dell' Apoc. 12" in *Div. Thom.*, 43 (1940), 215-22; A. Rivera, C.M.F., "Inimicias ponam" et "Signum magnum apparuit" in *Verb. Dom.*, 21 (1941), 113-22; 183-9; L. di Fonzo, O.F.M., "Interno al senso mariolog. dell' Apoc. c. 12" in *Marianum*, 3 (1941), 248-68; J. Sickenberger, "Die Messiasmutter in 12 Kap. des Apok." in *Theol. Quart.*, 126 (1946), 357-427; J. F. Bonnefoy, O.F.M., "Les interpretations ecclesiologues du ch. 12 de l'Apoc" in *Marianum*, 9 (1947), 208-222; E. Druwé, S. J., "La Mediation Universelle de Marie" in *Maria, Etudes*, I, 472; J.-M. Bover, S.J., "Marie, L'Eglise et le Nouvel Israel" in *Maria, Etudes*, I, 661-74; D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., "Did St. John See the Virgin Mary in Glory?" in *C.B.Q.*, 11 (1949), 249-62, 392-405, 12 (1950), 75-83, 155-61, 292-300, 405-15; R. Murphy, O.C., "Allusion to Mary in the Apoc." in *Th. Stud.*, 10 (1949), 565-73; D. Unger, O.F.M.Cap., "Cardinal Newman and Apoc. 12" in *Th. Stud.*, 11 (1950), 356-67.

[2] A comprehensive bibliography is given in *AER*, 125 (1951), 257-63. Important of *Apoc.* 12 in this regard are: L. da Fonseca, S.J., "Assunzione di Maria nella S. Scr." in *Bibl.*, 28 (1947), 321-62; J. Coppens, "La definibilité de l'Assomption" in *Eph. Th. Louv.*, 23 (1947), 17-19; I. Filiograssi, S.J., "De definibilitate Assump. B.V.M." in *Greg.*, 29 (1948), 34; M. Jugie, A.A., "La Mort et l'Assomption de la S. Vierge" in *Studi e Testi*, 144; Idem, "Assomption de la S. Vierge" in *Maria, Etudes*, 1, 627-31; L. Poirier, O.F.M., "La ch. 12 de l'Apoc., fait-il allusion a l'assomption?" *Vers le Dogme de l'assomption* (Montreal: Fides, 1948); G. Bissonette, "The twelfth ch. of the Apoc. and our Lady's Assumption" in *Marian Studies*, 2 (1951), 172. The Holy Father confined himself to the following statement regarding *Apoc.* 12: "The Scholastic Doctors have recognized the Assumption of the Virgin Mother of God as something signified, not only in various figures of the Old

the chapter fall neatly into three parts with six verses to each part.[3] *Act I (verses 1-6).* Brilliant is the vision with which the act opens. It is a great symbolic sign or portent. The setting is heaven.[4] A Woman is engulfed in the dazzling brightness of the sun itself, as in a garment of light;[5] her feet tread on the moon.[6] She is radiant with the celestial ornament of twelve stars which form her royal crown. And she is Mother! That is the one occupation mentioned of her: child-bearing, with all the care and pain of child-bearing, all the ardor and labor of bringing forth: "And she was with Child and cried out in the pangs of birth and in pain to be delivered" (v. 2). But at once another sign or portent appears on the scene: a great red Dragon. His color is one of fire and war, his appearance one of wordly might and power.[7] Seven heads he has, each one crowned with a diadem. Ten horns of power are upon those heads. But the occupation mentioned of him is that of ruthless destruction. For "his tail swept down one-third of the stars of heaven and cast them to the earth" (v. 4).

Stars crown the Woman; stars are swept down by the Dragon. The Woman is in the act of giving life to the world; the Dragon

---

Testament, but also in that Woman clothed with the Sun, whom St. John the Apostle contemplated on the island of Patmos" (*Munificentissimus Deus, AER,* 124 (1951), 10.

[3] Cf. J.-M. Bover, S.J., "El cap. 12 del Apoc. y el 3 del Gen." in *Estud. Eccles.,* 1 (1922), 319-36.

[4] The expression: ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ is used fourteen other times in the Apoc. and nowhere does it mean "on the heavens." Compare 4:1, 8:1, 11:15, 11:19; 12:7 f.; 12:10; 13:6; 14:17; 15:1; 15:5; 19:1; 19:14. This heaven is the abode of God.

[5] Clothed with a garment is the idea conveyed by: περιβλημένη as the parallels show: *Apoc.* 7:9; 7:13; 10:1; 11:3; 17:4; 18:16; 19:8; 19:13; Yahweh is clothed with light as with a garment: ἀναβλλόμενος φῶς . . . (*Ps.* 103 [104], 2).

[6] In N.T. Greek: ὑποκάτω is interchangeable with ὑπό, "under": (*Apoc.* 5:3; 5:13; 6:9). But in every instance where the entire expression ὑποκάτω τῶν ποδῶν is found in Scripture, it has the meaning of subjection: *Ps.* 8:7 (also quoted in *Hebr.* 2:8); *Mal.* 4:3 (*Hebr.* 3:21); in *Ps.* 109 (110):1 ὑποκάτω is also used when quoted by *Mark* 12:36 in B W D, 28 (1542) sys gg co. An apparent exception is *Mark* 6:11, "Shake off the dust from beneath your feet." But the figure is evidently different, and *Matt.* uses ἐκ.

[7] In *Apoc.* 6:4 the same adjective is used for the symbol of war. But its substantive πῦρ is chiefly used in N.T. to denote hell-fire. How this Dragon can said to be in heaven will be shown later.

is in the act of destroying a great part of it. Thus the two great figures of this scene are ushered in, described separately at first, as just mentioned, but then immediately in relation to each other. The Dragon is the sworn enemy of the Woman: "And the Dragon stationed himself before the Woman who was about to be delivered, so that when she was delivered he might devour her Child" (v. 4). Not satisfied with destroying the third part of the heavens, he is all out to devour the Woman's offspring. Why this hatred against the Woman and her Child? Why this desire to make an end of the Child? The reason is given as the action proceeds.

Now the scene changes and we are on earth. The Child is no other than the Lord of the world: "And she gave birth to a son, a male,[8] who is to rule all the nations with a rod of iron; and her Child[9] was caught up to God and His throne. Then the Woman fled to the desert, where she has a place prepared by God, that there they might nourish her for 1260 days."[10] Notice that what is said of the Woman and her Child spells a twofold defeat for the Dragon, namely, the failure to devour or harm the Child, for "he was caught up to God and His throne"; and the further failure to inflict harm on the Woman, for she hid herself and was cared for by God.

That ends the first act. The Woman and her Child disappear from the scene unharmed, unconquered. No wonder the Dragon wanted to snuff out the life of the Child, for, with all his power of seven heads, ten horns and seven diadems, the Dragon was but a usurper of world power. Here was the true Lord of the world.

Act II (verses 7-12). Again the setting is heaven. There is war and a battle: "And there was war in heaven, Michael and his angels going forth to make war with the Dragon; and the Dragon and his angels fought, and did not prevail, nor was their place found anymore in heaven" (vv. 7-8). Why were they cast out? There is no offense mentioned, other than the one given in the first part of the first act, where the setting was also heaven, namely,

[8] Spencer translates "a Male Child." The Greek has *ἔτεκεν υἱόν, ἄρσεν.*

[9] Both here and in v. 4 the Greek has *τὸ τέκνον.*

[10] A symbolic number. 1260 days is the same amount of time as 42 months (11:2-3; 13:5) or 3 and a half years. This latter expression seems to be that intended in 12:14: "a time [year] and times [dual form of time, i.e. 2 years] and half a time [half a year], as we find it in the Aramaic part of *Dan.* 7:25. Cf. Strack-Billerbeck, *Kommentar z. N.T.*, 4, 996 ff.

the Dragon had refused submission to the Lord of the world, the rightful heir of all.

But the action proceeds. The Dragon was cast down to the earth. Now the sacred writer tells us who the Dragon is: "He is the ancient Serpent (ὁ ὄφις ὁ ἀρχαῖος: *Gen.* 3:14-15 LXX) who is called the Devil and Satan, the deceiver of the whole world" (v. 9). He will deceive men and blind them to the truth.

There follows a hymn of victory, sung in heaven. It sings the downfall of Satan, and the triumph of God's Anointed, the Christ. It sings further the triumph of martyrs, who, one with Christ, conquer the Dragon, namely, by choosing to die with Christ in testimony of the truth: "They have conquered him [the Dragon] because of the Blood of the Lamb and because of the utterances of their testimony. And they clung not to their life even when facing death" (v. 11). Thus it was the death of the Lamb that enabled these martyrs to triumph over the deceiver of the world. But the voice from heaven continues: "Woe to the earth and to the sea. Because the Devil has descended to you in great fury, knowing that he has but a short time" (v. 12). A woe is pronounced on the earth, the third of the woes mentioned in 11:14: "Lo, the third woe shall come quickly."[11]

Act III (verses 13-18). Again the scene is on earth and the action between the Dragon and the Woman is resumed. Now it is the Woman alone who is the object of his fury: "And when the Dragon saw that he was cast down to the earth, he went in pursuit of the Woman who had given birth to the son, the male. And the two wings of the great eagle were given to the Woman so that she might fly into the desert to her place, where she is nourished for a time, and times and half a time,[12] away from the presence of the Serpent" (vv. 13-14). So the Dragon fails to harm the Woman because she has God's special protection, symbolized by the wings of the eagle (as can be inferred from *Ex.* 19:4; *Deut.* 32:11).

A second attempt is made by the Dragon-Serpent (the Dragon is now called the Serpent by the Sacred writer) to overthrow the

[11] *Apoc.* 8:13 mentions three woes to come upon the earth. Two are pronounced as accomplished in 9:12 and 11:14. The third is announced in 11:14 and evidently refers to the reign of the Beast (ch. 13). Thus *Apoc.* 12:12 connects the chapter with the following scenes in ch. 13.

[12] See note 10, *supra.*

Woman. Then the Serpent vomited water from his mouth like a river after the Woman, that he might cause her to be carried away by the stream" (v. 15). This time help comes again to the Woman and it is from the side of the earth which opened its mouth and sucked up the river vomited from the mouth of the Serpent. So whatever may be tried, the Dragon-Serpent was foiled. He was unable to harm the Woman who remained inviolable against his attacks.

The final action of the Dragon in this chapter is his resolve to wage war on the remainder of the Woman's offspring. They are characterized as those who observe the commandments of God and hold the testimony of Jesus (v. 17).[13] Chapter 12 ends with the Dragon stationing himself on the shore of the sea to invest with his power and with his throne and with all his authority the Beast which comes up out of the sea (ch. 13). By its very appearance, the Beast is recognized as the Dragon's offspring.

From this mere literary analysis certain points are clear:

(1) The Dragon is Satan, who is the Enemy to the Lord of the world and to the one who bore the Lord of the world.

(2) The Lord of the world is, first of all, Christ the Messias. St. John[14] takes special pains to show that:

(a) He describes him with a quotation taken from a psalm that is admittedly messianic:[15] "You shall rule the nations with a rod of iron" (*Ps.* 2:9). For no one else but the Messias does the Old Testament claim such world-rule.

(b) In explicit terms this is expressed in Apocalypse 19:11-16: "His Name is called Word of God. . . . He shall rule the nations with a rod of iron. . . . He has upon His robe and upon His thigh a Name. King of kings and Lord of lords."

(c) In order that no one will miss the point, St. John inserts in our present verse (12:5) the word "all": "He shall rule all the nations with a rod of iron." There can be no reason-

[13] Observing the commandments of God and holding fast to the testimony of Jesus are the two marks by which one can tell the sons of God according to St. John's own elaboration in *1 John*, 3-5. See also *Apoc.* 14:12.

[14] St. John the Apostle is author of the Apocalypse according to the traditional view. Cf. J. Steinmueller, *Companion to Scr. Stud.*, 3, 388 ff. But see also the article by P. Gaechter, S.J., in *Th. Stud.*, 9 (1948), 419-52.

[15] Its messianic character is frequently borne witness to in the N.T.: *Acts* 4:25-8; 13:33; *Hebr.* 1:5; 5:5. Such world dominion was not fulfilled in anyone but the Messias.

able doubt then, that the Woman's offspring is Christ, the Messias, the Lord of the world and universal King.

(3) The Lord of the world in this same verse also designates the members of Christ's mystical body. This follows:

(a) From the grammatical context: The Woman brings forth a son, a male (*υἱόν, ἄρσεν*). There is no other mention of the Woman's bringing forth than this. Yet in the same chapter that offspring (*υἱόν, ἄρσεν*) is both individual and collective:[16] individual, when it is designated as "the Child" (*τὸ τέκνον*: v. 4 and v. 6); collective, when referred to as "the remainder of her seed" (*οἱ λοιποὶ τοῦ σπέρματος αὐτῆς*: v. 17). Thus "the Child" and "the remainder of her seed" are both included in the "son, the male" (*υἱόν, ἄρσεν*) born of the Woman, as Lord of the world.[17]

(b) This also follows from the parallel text of Apocalypse 2:27, where the members of Christ are given a share in the rule of the world: "To the victor and to him who guards my words to the end, I will give authority over the nations, and he *shall rule them with a rod of iron.*"

(c) It is likewise the teaching of the earliest Fathers who comment on this chapter 12 of the Apocalypse. For St. Hippolytus, the son, the male, is Christ the perfect man, Head and members.[18] St. Methodius[19] and St. Victorinus of Pettau[20] likewise.

[16] St. John must have meant to convey something by his deliberate use of the singular *τὸ τέκνον* twice (vv. 4.6), the general *υἱόν, ἄρσεν* twice (vv. 5.13) and the other collective terms: *οἱ λοιποί* (v. 17). The explanation given here does no violence to the text, but flows from it naturally. The Beloved Disciple surely knew the doctrine of the Mystical Body for he wrote long after St. Paul, and moreover he has given us the same truth in the Vine and the Branches (John 15). The Mystical Body of Christ is not a figure of speech, but a reality, and it can be described in different ways.

[17] The expression *ἔτεκεν υἱόν, ἄρσεν* hearkens back to *Is.* 66.7 (*ἔτεκεν ἄρσεν*) where the male child refers to the New Israel, taken collectively. But see note 44, *infra.*

[18] Hippolytus, *De Antichristo,* 3 and 61; *CGS* Berol.; Hippol. 1, 2 pp. 6 and 41 f. The English translation in Roberts (*Ante-Nicene Fathers,* 5, 204 and 217) is inferior and inexact in these passages.

[19] Methodius, *Symposium,* 8, 4.18; *CGS* 85, 18 ff.; Roberts 6, 336.

[20] Victorinus, in Apoc.: *CSEL* 49, 113; *MGL* 5, 336. It will be interesting to see what the recent microfilming of manuscript both on Mt. Sinai and in the Vatican library brings to light with regard to this and similar points.

(4) The Woman gives birth to Christ, Head and members, in one and the same act. Who is this woman, the object of Satan's fury, decked out as Queen of the Heavens, in the great throes of Motherhood in order to give to the world its rightful heir and king, and what role has she to play at this juncture of the apocalyptic visions, placed as she is before the reign of the Beast in chapter 13? From the foregoing is not the impression received that she is a concrete and individual personality? What prevents us from stating that the Woman symbolizes the Blessed Mother?

OBJECTIONS TO THE WOMAN'S SYMBOLIZING MARY

Formerly it was a frequent objection that the description of the Woman is incompatible with the Blessed Mother. Here are the chief points:

First objection: the birth-pangs. Several satisfactory solutions can be given to reconcile the birth-pangs with the Virgin-Mother who suffered no such birth-pangs in bringing forth Christ, the Messias:

(1) To be born in pangs of birth (ὠδίνω) does not necessarily refer to physical pangs of child-bearing. St. Paul tells the Galatians (4:19) that he is in the pains of child-birth again (ὠδίνω) until Christ be formed in them. But he cannot mean the physical pangs of child-birth. In Romans 8:22 he says that all creation groans and agonizes until now (συν ὠδίνω). In both cases there is a question of sufferings in general or sufferings of soul.

(2) Likewise the expression "to be in pain to be delivered" (βασανίζω) is used in the New Testament either for physical or spiritual suffering.[21] Thus the picture of the Woman in the throes of child-bearing can represent spiritual sufferings, cares and anxieties, or even persecution. In Jeremias 30:6 it is a symbol of the sufferings of exile. For the earliest Fathers[22] it is the symbol of persecution or of the anguish of intense desire.

[21] In *Matt.* 8:6 it is physical: "Lord, my boy is lying in the house paralyzed in dreadful agony," in *2 Pet.* 2:8 it is spiritual: "Lot, that just man, had his upright soul tormented from day to day with the lawless doings of the people." The same expression (βασανίζω) is found four more times in addition in the *Apoc.* but each time it is used for torments in general (9:5; 11:10; 14:10; 20:10).

[22] St. Hippolytus, *l.c.*, considers it a picture of the persecution under Antichrist; St. Victorinus, a picture of the anguish of desire of the ancient church, to bring forth the Messias.

Consequently the picture *can* represent the universal Mother in her anguish of desire to bring forth Christ in the hearts of all men, or the spiritual sufferings which were the price of Motherhood of the whole Christ.

Second objection: The Woman has other children (v. 17) and this is said to militate against Mary's perpetual virginity. It is surprising that this objection is still made today.[23] Even a superficial examination of the use of the word Offspring (σπέρμα) in Scripture shows that it can stand both for physical offspring of carnal descent, and for those who are born in a spiritual manner of someone. In Galatians 3:29 Abraham's offspring (σπέρμα) are the Gentiles who believe, and thus become the spiritual sons of Abraham, but are not his sons by carnal descent. Scripture speaks of the seed of Satan, the Serpent (*Gen.* 3:15) and of the seed of God (*1 John* 3:9). So in Apocalypse 12:17, too, there *can* be a question of the spiritual progeny of the Woman and hence the dogma of Mary's perpetual virginity would be left intact.

Third objection: The Woman in chapter 12 is a symbol. Hence it cannot refer to an individual. This statement is not borne out by the Scriptural use of a symbol. The Lamb in Apocalypse 5 with seven horns and seven eyes is a symbol and yet it surely does refer to Christ the individual (see also *Dan.* 8:21-22).

Fourth objection: The Apocalypse is written long after Mary's departure from this earth. According to its author it is a prophecy (22:18) and consequently deals with the future. Thus it cannot refer to things that happened to the Blessed Mother in the past. A proper understanding of the nature of the apocalyptic books satisfies this objection. Such books were common in the centuries immediately preceding the Christian era. Symbols were used to signify events partly accomplished and partly to be fulfilled. The Apocalypse itself gives evidence of this. The Lamb in 5:6 is depicted as slain, and yet is about to execute the contents of the sealed scroll. The angel in 17:9 has the same to say about the seven heads of the Beast: "Five are fallen, one is, and the other

[23] E.g. among others, A. Wikenhauser, *Offenbarung des Johannes* (Regensburg, 1949), p. 82. These same authors, however, do take the phrase as spiritual progeny, for they speak of the "spiritual progeny of the Church." Wherein then lies the difficulty of considering these children as the spiritual progeny of Mary?

is not yet come." Chapter 12, then, can refer to past events in Mary's life and still be prophetic of something in the future.

Fifth objection: The detail of the flight into the desert for 1260 days does not fit the Blessed Mother. To this it may be said that it could be a literary device of the author to express the Woman's exemption from all diabolical influence. Moreover, also from a historical standpoint, it is not incompatible with the life of Mary, even if nothing is known to correspond to it. But precisely this detail will be taken up further on.

Far from the description of the Woman being incompatible with the Blessed Mother, it lends itself admirably to any number of truths of Mariology: (1) Mary's fullness of divine graces and gifts, symbolized by being clothed with Christ, the Light of the world. (2) Her exalted position in heaven where the entire body of the elect form her crown of glory, twelve being the number for universality. (3) The divine Motherhood of her whose Son is Messias, Universal King and Son of God (v. 5). (4) Spiritual Motherhood of the faithful by reason of which she suffered the birth-pangs of Calvary long before it became a reality (*Luke* 2:35). (5) Her complete exemption from all diabolical influence so as to remain unconquered by Satan in every way.

Yet the minds of many remain unconvinced that all this is anything more than apt accommodation. It does not prove sufficiently that the Holy Spirit, the author of Scripture, *intended* the Woman to symbolize the Blessed Mother, so that such is the true scriptural sense of the symbol. We must proceed further, then, with our study.

IS MARY INTENDED BY THE HOLY SPIRIT IN THE LITERAL SENSE?

It must be kept in mind that chapter 12 is a revelation given by God to St. John in a vision. Moreover, the Apocalypse is a prophecy (22:18). The Seer describes the symbolic vision as clearly as he can, but the full meaning of it is known to him only if it pleases God to make it known (cf. *Dan.* 7:16). God's meaning of the symbol in question, if not given by the sacred writer, will have to be ascertained by ruling out whatever the analogy of faith shows to be incompatible with the symbol; and at the same time by applying the other norms of Catholic exegesis (either literary or doctrinal as laid down by Pius XII in *Divino afflante Spiritu*) if they help clarify the issue.

EXCLUDING THE INCOMPATIBLE

(1) The Woman is not the Israel of the Old Testament, taken by itself. Some authors contented themselves with saying: "The Woman is the Chosen People of God, Israel, represented as a single person. From Israel the Messias sprang according to the flesh amid heavy birth-pangs." The following reasons militate against such an assumption.

(a) Israel can never be said to be mother both of Christ (v. 6) and of Christ's followers or members (v. 17). If circumcision and the Law were necessary for Christians, as some early Judaizers advocated, this view could have some backing. But just the opposite is the case. Not by any connection with Judaism or the Synagogue did one become a disciple of Christ, but by Baptism, an entirely new institution of Christ. And in becoming a member of Christ in Baptism, one by no means became a member of Israel. Israel, then, is not the Woman who begets Christ the Head and His members.[24]

(b) A picture of a woman in birth-pangs may well represent Israel amid many sufferings giving the Messias to the world, but the glorious Woman in v. 1 is poles apart from the reality of unfaithful Israel with her many failures and transgressions as the prophets depict her for us (cf. *Is.* 1:4-6; *Ez.* 16; etc.).

(c) Israel was never mother to Christians (v. 17). She persecuted them from the very beginning of Christianity.

(d) Israel's whole purpose was to give the Messias to the world. If John had Israel in mind, his emphasis upon the Woman after the birth of the Child (vv. 13-17) is meaningless. To imagine that it refers to a special protection of God for the unbelieving Jewish people in the Christian era does not fit into the picture.[25]

[24] These reasons are summarized from the excellent article of J. F. Bonnefoy, as mentioned in note 1. Attention can also be called to the fact mentioned above, that this mother, by one and the same act of motherhood, gives birth to both the personal Christ and the members of Christ, which can never be said of Israel. Cf. also J. Lortzing, "Die innere Beziehung zw. John 2 and Offb. 12" in *Theol. u. Gl.*, 29 (1937), 509 ff.

[25] Cf. M. Meinertz, *Theologie des N.T.* (Bonn, 1950), p. 329. A different angle is to consider the Woman as the Church at the end of time when Israel shall have come into the fold. This will be taken up further on.

(2) The Woman is not the Christian Church founded by Christ, taken by itself.

(a) The Church may well be depicted as the mother of Christians, the members of Christ, but never of the personal Christ Himself. It is certain that the Woman's Child in v. 5 f. includes the personal Christ, so it is against all the rules of symbolism to designate as His Mother the very institution that He founded, which is rather symbolized as the New Eve coming forth from His side on the cross. The Church is the Spouse of Jesus Christ.

(b) Nor can we simply say that we have here a figure of speech which is elastic. First of all, a figure of speech is not identical with a symbolic vision. Moreover, a figure of speech has to correspond to the rules of thought. Would anyone ever think of calling the United States of America the mother of George Washington? Likewise it is incorrect to call the Church the Mother of Jesus.

(3) The Woman is not the personified People of God, the Community of the Just of both Testaments, both faithful Israel out of which the Messias took flesh and spiritual Israel, the Church, considered as one. This is St. Augustine's interpretation, who holds that the Woman is the City of God from the just Abel down to the last Saint; and it is the opinion of several notable authors today.[26]

Against this we must note the following. No one doubts that in heaven the just of all times form one People of God, one Kingdom of God and His Christ, one Communion of Saints; no one doubts that the People of God in the Old Testament can well be represented by the symbol of a woman (as in the prophets and that the People of God in the New Testament can well be represented by the figure of a woman (as in St. Paul and the Fathers of the Church). But it is quite another thing to say that the same identical symbol can represent at the same time both the People of God in the Old Testament and those of the New Testament *in their sojourn on earth*. Their images are related to each other as type and antitype, figure and fulfillment; they have a different origin, organization, program of action, extension in time and place, and it

[26] E. B. Allo, O.P., *St. Jean, l'Apocalypse* (Paris, 1933), pp. 193 f.; A. Gelin, *La sainte bible* (Paris, 1946), 12, 629; A. Wikenhauser, *op. cit.*, p. 82; M. Meinertz, *op. cit.*, p. 329; F. Gigot, O.P., Westminster version to the Apoc.; R. Murphy, *op. cit.*, p. 569.

is difficult to see how they can be blended together under one and the same symbol. If the observations concerning the *υἱόν ἄρσεν* hold good, as was explained earlier in the literary analysis of Apocalypse 12, namely, that the Woman is Mother *simultaneously* of the personal Christ and His members, the Woman is not the Community of the just of both Testaments.[27]

(4) The Woman is not Mary, taken alone. Despite the fact that the symbolic vision of chapter 12 has been shown to correspond to many truths of Mariology, an adequate explanation of the flight into the desert for 1260 days (vv. 6 and 14) is not forthcoming. This detail evidently connects the chapter with the foregoing (11:2-3) and the following chapter (13:5). It brings us to the final possibility.

THE WOMAN IS SIMULTANEOUSLY AN INDIVIDUAL AND A COLLECTIVITY

If we examine the symbols in the book of Daniel we find that they allow a certain amount of fluctuation in the objects they symbolize. Not that they fluctuate between designating various objects, but rather between a collective body and the chief representative of that collective body. The golden head of the statue in Daniel 2 refers to Nabuchodonosor in person and at the same time, the Babylonian Empire in its entirety.[28] The two-horned ram in chapter 8 (vv. 3 and 20), according to the tenor of the angel's ex-

[27] Does not the metaphor of the olive tree (*Rom.* 11:16-17) prove that one and the same symbol can symbolize both Old and New Covenants simultaneously? I do not think so. A real difficulty is encountered in understanding the root to be Abraham and the patriarchs. De facto, the branches do not derive their holiness from Abraham but from Christ. Abraham's holiness is likewise derived from Christ. Only after the Incarnation and the refusal of the Jewish nation to accept Christ was that nation rejected (temporarily) and the "branches cut off." It is Christ, then, who is the root that sanctifies the whole tree, if the branches are grafted on it. The olive tree, would be another metaphor for the Mystical Body of Christ as Origen already noted in his Commentary to Romans, 8, 11 (*MPG* 14, 1193). But the opposite view prevails today. See M. Bourke, *A Study of the Metaphor of the Olive Tree* (Washington, D. C., 1947).

[28] Daniel tells Nabuchodonosor that the statue he saw in the dream had a head of gold, breast and arms of silver, etc. (2:32-34). But Daniel himself gave the interpretation: "Thou art a king of kings, Nabuchodonosor. Thou art the head of gold. But after thee shall rise up *another kingdom, inferior to*

planation, symbolizes the Medo-Persian Empire and at the same time its chief representative who fought the Greeks. Similarly with the he-goat in the same chapter. The son of man in chapter 7 symbolizes both the Holy One of Israel[29] and His people, the holy ones of God (vv. 14, 21, 27). In all these cases God *intended* to symbolize both the collective body and its chief representative by one and the same symbol, and in both cases we are dealing with the Scriptural sense of the symbol. There need be no question of a double literal sense, for the collective body and its chief representative do not form two diverse objects, but one organic unity. They really are one.

Let us apply this to Apocalypse 12. The Woman signifies an individual,[30] and no other individual can be meant but Mary, for Mary alone became Mother simultaneously of the personal Christ and of those who are His members.[31] The Woman signifies, at the same time, a collective body that is organically one with Mary, namely, the Church, which is born of Mary, and is truly the fruit of her womb, and of which she is truly Mother and Ideal.[32] This

thee, of silver, and another of brass, etc." (2:37-40). But several kings succeeded Nabuchodonosor before the Babylonian "kingdom" was succeeded by another "kingdom." Thus Nabuchodonosor alone could not have been symbolized by the head of gold, but rather the Empire with him as its most important representative. This fluctuation has been well demonstrated by M. Gruenthaner, S.J., "The Four Empires of Daniel" in *C.B.Q.*, 8 (1946), 73. See also *Apoc.* 17:9 for a double signification of a symbol (*Confrat. Comment.* p. 671).

[29] That the Son of man symbolizes Christ is evident from the world power that is fulfilled only in the Messias (7:14; *Luke*, 1:33).

[30] The demands of the context corroborate this explanation of the symbol, for if the Dragon and the Male-child signify, first of all, individuals, so should the Woman.

[31] "In the same holy bosom of His most chaste Mother, Christ took to himself flesh, and united to himself the spiritual body formed by those who were to believe in him. Therefore, all we who are united to Christ . . . have issued from the womb of Mary like a body united to its head. Hence, though in a spiritual and mystical fashion, we are all children of Mary and she is mother of us all." Bl. Pius X, *Ad diem illum* (*ASS*, 36 [1903-4]), 455. "Our Savior was constituted the Head of the whole human Family in the womb of the Blessed Virgin." Pius XII, *Mystici Corporis* (NCWC ed., p. 19).

[32] The intimate relations of Mary and the Church is set forth by M. Scheeben, *Die Dogmatik*, 3, n. 1531; idem, *Mariology* (Herder, 1947), 1, 211; 2, 66 f.; also by D. Unger, in *C.B.Q.*, 12 (1950), 407 ff.; G. Montagne, S.M.,

double signification of the symbol of the Woman was already considered common view in the fifth century in the West[33] and is represented by a steady line of interpreters down to our own day.[34]

Yet I think that the Woman (Mary) represents something more than precisely the Church in general here, and that is the Church in its final stage of perfection on earth, when the Ideal of the Perfect Woman which God always had in mind, has worked itself out perfectly in the Church, namely, when the Church of the Consummation has acquired the full likeness of the Ideal Virgin-Mother. I say the Church in its final stage on earth, for that is where chapter 12 fits into the Apocalypse, to wit: "when the mystery of God achieves its full perfection, in the days of the voice of the seventh angel, when he is about to sound" (10:7; 11:15). That, however, is bound up with the return of Israel to Christ (ch. 11), at the time of the Antichrist (ch. 13).[35]

"The Concept of Mary and the Church of the Fathers" in *AER*, 123 (1950), 331-7. An excellent article dealing with the patristic treatment of this theme is that of H. Rahner, S.J., "Die Gottesgeburt" in *Z. f. K. Th.*, 59 (1935), 333-418.

[33] "There is no one of you who doesn't know that the Woman signifies the Virgin Mary who bore our inviolate Head, herself inviolate, who also showed forth in herself the ideal of Holy Church, so that as she remained a Virgin through giving birth to a son, so also the Church brings forth his members throughout all time, but does not lose her virginity." (*Brev. Rom.*, Vig. Pent. Lect. 5); words of St. Quodvultdeus c. 450, or a contemporary of his (*De symbolo* [*MPL*, 40, 661]). The wording of this testimony argues for a rather general acceptance of this view at that time. As to the Fathers in the East, Epiphanius (who spent 50 years in Palestine) comments already in the middle of the 4th century on *Apoc.* 12, and takes it for granted that the Woman signifies Mary (*Haeres.*, 78, 11 [*MPG*, 42, 716]). Andrew of Caesarea (between 500 and 600) also testifies that some before him interpreted the Woman to be Mary, but because of the "birth-pangs" he himself prefers to hold the view of St. Methodius (c. 312) that the Church is meant (*MPG*, 106, 320). These facts show that the patristic testimony of the Marian interpretation is not at all so late as some would have us think, but rather quite early.

[34] The history of this tradition is given by H. Rahner, *op. cit.*, pp. 397 ff.; far more comprehensively by A Rivera in *Verb. Dom.*, 21 (1941); still more detailed by D. Unger in *C.B.Q.*, 1949-1950 (see note 1, *supra*). That the Woman refers to Mary and the Church is held by far more authors than is generally supposed.

[35] The most ancient patristic commentary on ch. 12 is that of St. Hippolytus († 237), *loc. cit.*, who is very clear in stating that the Woman rep-

THE MEANING OF CHAPTER TWELVE

The salient features of chapter 12 can now be pointed out. But first of all let us recall that chapter 12 and 13 are intimately connected (cf. 12:6; 12:14; 13:5). If chapter 13 is the reign of the Beast, then chapter 12 is the setting of the stage for that event. And in that capacity, chapter 12 has a wide perspective. Prophecies, and eschatological prophecies in particular, often project *the first and last phase* of a given reality onto one and the same field of vision, the intervening interval being passed over. The prophet Joel gives us a good example of this when in one and the same vision he describes the first and the last phase of the Messianic era.[36] Our Lord does the same in the eschatological prophecy of the doom of Jerusalem and the doom of the world (*Matt.* 24) which has been characterized as the first and last phase of the coming Judgment.

The Apocalypse, interpreted eschatologically, gives the same picture. It is the Grand Finale of the Kingdom of God on earth, the mosaic of all prophecies in a final synthesis.[37] Chapters 1-3 are the *first phase* of Christ's Kingdom on earth, the Son of man in the midst of the seven Churches, dictating the seven letters to the Church contemporary with St. John.[38] Chapters 4-20 is the *last*

---

resents the Church at the time of the persecution of Antichrist. In the above view, then, both lines of patristic interpretation of the Woman flow together, namely, the one that (in both East and West) designates the Woman as Mary, and the most ancient that designates the Woman as the Church at the time of Antichrist.

[36] *Joel* 2:28-32 (*Hebr.* 3:1-5): "And it shall come to pass after this that I will pour out my Spirit on all flesh; and your sons and your daughters shall prophesy . . . and I will show wonders in heaven; and in earth, blood, and fire and vapor of smoke. The sun shall be turned into darkness . . . before the great and dreadful day of the Lord come." St. Peter (*Acts* 2:16-21) states that these words of Joel were fulfilled on Pentecost day, when the first phase of that prophecy was fulfilled.

[37] It is worthy of note that at the very opening of the Apocalypse (1:8) our Lord says: "I am the Alpha and Omega," which means I am the first and the last, the beginning and the consummation. Is this a clue given to St. John to understand the visions granted to him according to the pattern of first and last phase, beginning and consummation of Christ's Kingdom on earth?

[38] That the seven Churches represent the universal Church is proven from the symbolism of the number seven, from the plural "Churches" at the end of each promise (2:7, etc.) and from the conviction of the early Fathers.

phase of Christ's Kingdom on earth, the Lamb executing the decrees of the sealed scroll, down to the last trumpet sound of the seventh angel, the third great woe, which is the reign of the personal Antichrist (the first Beast) in chapter 13.[39]

Yet just before that scene unfolds before the eyes of the Seer, another vision is introduced which gives the background and the deeper reason for chapter 13. It is that of the Woman and Dragon in their implacable enmity, seen in vision according to the *same prophetical pattern of the first and last phase.*

The very first phase when God unfolded His ineffable mystery of Mary, the perfect Woman, and her Divine Offspring before the gaze of the angels, and Satan refused to bow (vv. 1-4). The very last phase of that enmity when the mystery of God achieved its full perfection (10:7 and 11:15) in the Marian Church of the Consummation, which, as the perfect double of the Virgin-Mother, brings forth the man child in great sufferings, by begetting Israel in the latter days as members of Christ; and for these very reasons, the object of the full wrath and fury of Satan (vv. 5-6).

It shows us also the first and last phase of the defeat of Satan: the first phase when his pride was punished by his being thrown out of heaven (vv. 7-9); the last phase when he is defeated by the humility and faith of the martyrs under Antichrist, who lay down their lives with the Crucified Lamb, whose death spelled Satan's defeat on Calvary (vv. 10-12).[40] In both the first and the last phase St. Michael the Archangel plays an important role (see *Dan.* 12:1).

And finally it shows us the first and last phase of the Victory of the Woman and Child. The first phase is the prodigy of the Virgin-Mother and the Divine Child inviolable against all the cunning and attacks of Satan (v. 6). The last phase, the prodigy of the in-

[39] Today it is generally admitted that this Beast is not merely the pagan Roman Empire, but also the personal Antichrist and his empire of the latter days. Again we have the application of the principle of first and last phase: Antichrist in the first phase of Christ's Kingdom on earth (the pagan Roman Empire), and Antichrist in the last phase of that Kingdom (personal Antichrist and his empire).

[40] When prophecy focusses various events on a field of vision, chronological sequence is known to be neglected in many cases. The same can hold good here. If the woe in v. 12 is mentioned after the victory of the martyrs in v. 11, it does not follow that such is the order of things in time. Prophecy simply shows the connection between events.

violable Marian Church of the Consummation, after the return of Israel, miraculously protected by God from harm during the reign of Antichrist, as was Israel of old in Egypt (*Ex.* 9:16; 10:23; 12:13).[41] This is the flight of the Woman into the desert (vv. 6, 13-16). Once the Redemption has been accomplished, Christ is identified with His members and Mary with the Church. This view does seem to satisfy best the various details of chapter 12.

The glorious Woman of chapter 12 is the Blessed Mother of God and our Mother, clothed with Christ, the Light, Queen of the Universe, Conqueror over all her adversaries, God's chosen ideal for all the redeemed,[42] the sign of salvation for the sons of God, the sign of defeat to Satan and hell. The ever Blessed Mary symbolizes simultaneously (in this picture) God's prodigy of the latter times, the Church modelled on the Ideal Mother, giving birth to Israel as members of Christ, protected by God from the fury of Satan in the impending reign of Antichrist, when the mystery of God has achieved its full perfection.

Throughout the Scriptures, the Woman and her Child are the prodigy of God, the sign of man's supernatural salvation and divinization. That explains the fury of Lucifer in heaven (*Apoc.* 12:3) in his refusal to agree to this plan of God. At the very moment that he had defeated our first parents, the prodigy of the Woman and Child was proclaimed to Satan to be his eventual undoing and defeat (*Gen.* 3:14-15). Simultaneously the Woman and Child were the sign of salvation and victory given to mankind, the object of their faith and hope until the sign became a reality. Thousands of years later, when God's own people were on the brink of

[41] Worthy of note is Victorinus of Pettau's interpretation, *loc. cit.* For him the 144,000 who were sealed from harm by God (7:4) are identical with the Woman protected from harm in ch. 12:14. It is remarkable that the 144,000 turn up again after ch. 13 as sharers of the Lamb's name and power in 14:1-5.

[42] As God's chosen ideal for His family on earth, Mary is also the Ideal Israel. She summed up in herself all the perfection of the Old Testament saints. Cf. J. Fenton, "Regina Patriarcharum" in *AER*, 122 (1950), 146-9; idem, "Our Lady Queen of Prophets" in *AER*, 124 (1951), 381-6; J.-M. Bover, S.J., "Marie, L'Eglise et le Nouvel Israel," *op. cit.* For another interesting angle of this ideal representation see L. Welserscheimb, S.J., "Das Kirchenbild der griecheschen Väterkommentare" in *Z. f. k. Th.*, 70 (1948), 448.

spiritual bankruptcy under King Achaz, the same prodigy of the Woman and Child was shown to Isaias as a guarantee of God's plans for His people (*Is.* 7:14). Micheas, too, saw the wonder. For him it was the Great Mother for whom all were waiting that she bring forth (*Mich.* 5:12). Nor were these the only prophets who were given to see the prodigy of God. But it was Elizabeth who, under the impulse of the Holy Spirit, recognized the prodigy in reality, and proclaimed with a loud voice: Blessed art thou among women and blessed is the fruit of thy womb (*Luke* 1:42). And every child of God on earth repeats that phrase daily.

Isaias and Micheas saw the prodigy in vision before it became a reality. Both recognized a true Child and a true Mother (see *Matt.* 1:22). After the vision had been fulfilled, after the Redemption had been accomplished, after the Virgin-Birth of Christ and the divine Motherhood of Mary had been clearly set forth in the Gospels of Matthew and Luke, the prodigy of the Woman and Child was seen again in vision, this for the last time, by the Beloved Disciple. Was it not a psychological necessity for him to recognize the Woman and the Child, the same prodigy of God, the same sign of supernatural salvation? But now from another angle. Now Calvary is past. Now the Woman can be seen in her great role of Mother of all the living, the role which wed her to suffering.[43] Does St. John need to tell us who she is, after he has brought out the similarity with Genesis 3:15 so strikingly?[44] And as if to

[43] Cf. A. Mullaney, O.P., "The Mariology of St. Thomas" in *AER*, 123 (1950), 197.

[44] The foundation for this assertion is v. 9, an undeniable reference to *Gen.* 3:15. Other points of identity are too evident to be overlooked. Nevertheless, L. Poirier, O.F.M., *op. cit.*, thinks that St. John is not referring to *Gen.* 3:15 but to *Is.* 66:7 in this chapter: "Before she was in travail she brought forth, before pangs came upon her she gave birth to a man-child" (Kissane, *Isaias*). St. John is referring undoubtedly to *Is.* 66:7 also. But let us remember that *Is.* 66:7 depicts a virgin-birth for the man-child as Kissane notes very clearly: "Before she travailed. The subject is not Sion, but indefinite (a woman) and there is an implied comparison of Sion to a woman who gives birth to a son without having to endure the pains of child-birth" (*Isaias*, 2, 324). Irenaeus himself used this text of Isaias to prove the Virgin-birth of Christ: Quoting *Isaias* 66:7 Irenaeus continues: "Thus he showed His birth from the virgin was unforeseen and unexpected" (*The Demonstrations of Apostolic Preaching*, translated by J. A. Robinson [New York, 1920], p. 118). Thus both *Isaias* 66:7 and *Apoc.* 12:4 give us the same picture: God's prodigy, the wonderful rebirth of Israel from a Virgin-Mother.

forestall all doubt, he will tell us who she is, in the very last of his great writings, the Gospel (for the Gospel is written after the Apocalypse). There he will show us the Mother of all the living, the Mother of the sons of God. Christ Himself makes her known: Behold, this is thy Mother"[45] (*John* 19:26 in the force of the Greek particle ἴδε). That completes the Mosaic which the Beloved Disciple had been constructing all through his writings.[46]

But for John in the Apocalypse, the Woman and Child are not only a reality, they are also a symbol. Christ and Mary are seen in their all-embracing relation to redeemed mankind, the Church as the Body of Christ, the Church as the fruit of Mary's womb.

He to whom it was given to see at the very outset of the apocalyptic visions, the dazzling vision of Christ in the midst of the Church (the lamp stands, ch. 1), which is the vision of the first phase of Christ's kingdom on earth, was also given to see in chapter 12 the brilliant vision of Mary and the Church, the last phase of Christ's Kingdom on earth, the Church in which the Ideal has been realized, the Church in which the supernatural has blossomed to perfection. On that Church Satan vents his full fury for it is identified with the Woman whom he hates. But even the Beast, invested with all the power of hell, will never succeed in destroying the Woman, for she is God's prodigy also in the latter times, and the whole world will witness that her Bridegroom is Emmanuel, God-with-us.

With superb brevity, St. John has set forth in this chapter a grand prophecy. He describes what God wants His Church to be: a double of His Mother.[47] It is evident, then, why the Catholic Church has given such prominence to devotion to the Blessed

[45] Cf. T. Gallus, S.J., "Mulier, ecce filius tuus" in *Verb. Dom.*, 21 (1941), 289-97; J. Leal, S.J., "Beata Virgo Omnium Spiritualis Mater ex Jn. 19:26-27" in *Verb. Dom.*, 27 (1949), 65-73.

[46] It is characteristic of the Semitic mind to develop its theme gradually, by frequently coming back to it, and only in the end is the mosaic complete. See U. Holzmeister, S.J., "Steigernde Wiederholungen in den Schriften des N.T." in *Theol. Pr. Quartalschr.*, 90 (1937), 85-92.

[47] It is not without interest to note that wherever *Apoc.* 12 is used in the liturgy (in some 15 passages), the reference is to Mary and to no one else. Pius XII has made *Apoc.* 12:1 the introit for the new Mass formula of the Assumption. He does not take it precisely as a direct scriptural argument for the Assumption (as can be seen from the words of the encyclical given

Mother. There is more than an external motivation in it, there is an inner, vital and necessary relation.

For our times God has reserved the revelation made by the Blessed Mother, in which she requests the consecration of the whole world, the entire Church and every member in that Church, to her Immaculate Heart. Our gloriously reigning Pontiff has expressed his will that this consecration be carried out in every country, diocese, parish, and family. But a consecration is not merely the reciting of a formula; it implies a remodelling of heart and mind and ideals, an identifying of ourselves with the Mother who gave us Life. The Blessed Mother herself, then, has shown the way how the prophecy of Apocalypse 12 will be realized. She herself is gradually preparing the Church for the Age of Mary.[48]

BERNARD J. LEFROIS, S.V.D.

Saint Mary's Seminary
Techny, Illinois

---

in note 2, *supra*). Yet, the truth of our Lady's Assumption can well be contained in the picture of that perfect Woman, God's ideal for the redeemed (12:1), whose destinies are so intimately bound up with those of her divine Son. Cf. J. B. Carol, O.F.M. in his analysis of the encyclical in *AER*, 125 (1951), 264.

[48] Cf. R. Knopp, S.M., "Apostolic Consecration to Mary" in *AER*, 122 (1950), 350 f.; J. O'Maloney, O.F.M. Cap., "Sign in the Heavens" in *Orate Fratres*, 25 (1951), 532-41.

EASTER EVE

PART I

DECREE OF THE CONGREGATION OF SACRED RITES RESTORING THE SOLEMN EASTER VIGIL

From earliest times the Church was wont to celebrate in most solemn manner the vigil of our Lord's Resurrection, which St. Augustine calls "the mother of all holy vigils."[1] It used to be kept during the night hours preceding Easter Sunday. But as time went on the celebration, for various reasons, was anticipated—first in the early evening, then after midday, and finally in the morning of Holy Saturday. Along with this other changes were introduced, not without detriment to the original symbolism of the vigil service.

In our day, however, as we witness an ever-growing research in the ancient liturgy, there is born a lively desire to have the Paschal vigil restored to its earlier grandeur, especially by returning to the original time of its observance, namely during the night preceding the Sunday of Resurrection. There is a special pastoral reason in favor of such restoration—to encourage the attendance of the faithful. For Holy Saturday is no longer a holiday as formerly, and thus many of the faithful cannot be present at the sacred ceremonies when they take place in the morning.

Prompted by these reasons, many bishops, priests, and religious, as well as a large number of the laity have petitioned the Holy See to allow a return to the ancient practice of keeping the Easter vigil in the night hours between Holy Saturday and Easter Sunday. Pius XII, the Supreme Pontiff, has received this request in a gracious way, and owing to his interest and solicitude about a matter of such importance, has entrusted it to a special commission of experts in this field, who in turn have subjected the whole business to diligent consideration and study.

Finally, on the recommendation of the undersigned Cardinal Prefect of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, His Holiness has deigned to approve the directions which follow. The bishop of a diocese is granted the faculty for this year to restore the celebration of the Easter vigil to the night hours, as his prudent judgment will dictate, and the faculty is in the nature of an experiment. Therefore, the bishops who will avail themselves of this faculty are requested to make a report

[1] Sermo 219, *MPL*, 38, 1088.

to the Congregation of Sacred Rites, as to how successful the restored practice was, with mention of the people's attendance and their devotion. Moreover, all publishers are forbidden to print the new rite without express permission of the Congregation of Sacred Rites, anything to the contrary notwithstanding.

February 9, 1951

✠ C. Cardinal Micara, Bishop of Velletri
Pro-prefect

L. ✠ S.

✠ A. Carinci, Archbishop of Seleucia
Secretary

The decree given above, although dated Feb. 9, 1951, was promulgated somewhat later in the *Acta Apostolicae Sedis,* with the issue published on Feb. 26, 1951. Simultaneously the Vatican Polyglot Press brought out a revised rite to be followed whenever the new privilege is used. The Latin text for both, along with a very enlightening commentary on the rubrics, can be found in a special supplement to *Ephemerides liturgicae.*[2] Since the editor of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* has been so generous as to allow space enough for a rather long paper on the topic, we will come to the ceremonial part in due course. In fact, all changes which in any way affect the recitation of the Divine Office, the vigil service itself, and the solemn Mass will be given in their entirety, so that, in an emergency, every priest will find it possible to prepare for the celebration and to carry it through with the aid of this article, along with those texts and rubrics which have long been in the missal and are in no way affected by the revised version. All pastors, certainly, will want to obtain eventually the well printed and bound typical edition published by the Vatican Press. But since the demand for it has been so great, it can be safely predicted that the supply will not immediately fill the needs of all. In many countries of Europe, Catholic publications have been carrying the full text ever since it was made available by the official sources in Rome, yet nothing of the kind has come to our notice from the American press. The Newman Bookshop (Westminster, Maryland) has issued a booklet with

[2] Vol. 65 (1951), Fasc. 1—Supplementum.

the full rite in English for the people's participation, at a price sufficiently low to put it in the hands of everyone who will assist at the vigil service.

REACTION AND RESPONSE

It is interesting to note the reaction of the Catholic world to this rather revolutionary step taken by the Vatican. The response in clerical circles, as can well be imagined, ranged from highest enthusiasm down the line through diminishing degrees of fervor to indifference. Anyone who thinks that priests are made of a pattern does not know many representatives of the cloth. To the enthusiasts it was a matter for surprise to find fellow clerics who said in effect: "This Roman pronouncement doesn't do a thing for me." Some viewed the desire for such a restoration as an archeological nicety, an unearthing of a museum piece. Others of a more practical bent of mind foresaw, with certain justification, that using the privilege would entail a hardship, in view of the many confessions associated with the day before Easter. In reality the problem here should not be any more insurmountable than it is at Christmas with midnight Mass; scarcely as much of a problem where the faithful have been prepared to receive the Eucharist on Maundy Thursday. Whether in heated controversy or in good-natured banter between the "more liturgical" and the "less liturgical" confreres, there is one feature that the former can use to decided advantage in striking the *coup-de-grace:* the consideration that the former twelve prophecies are now reduced to four in number. Usually when this is pointed out, absolute unanimity is achieved and relative amity is restored. Similar cause for everybody's rejoicing is found in the related fact that the celebrant may henceforth seat himself on the sedilia and do nothing but listen as the prophecies are chanted. No more for him what used to be a back-breaking ordeal—standing at the altar and reading from the missal for a half hour or longer. The burden for parish priests and sacristans will be relieved, moreover, by the fact that there will be no liturgy on Holy Saturday morning.

Perusal of Catholic newspapers and periodicals published in this country reveals that the editors, with few exceptions, held themselves in remarkable restraint when breaking the news about the new decree. If one recalls the treatment given a few years back

to the encyclical on the liturgy, *Mediator Dei,* and for that matter to *Mystici Corporis,* when every least negative point was singled out for censorious emphasis, while the large and generous and positive issues were passed over, one can feel a certain relief that such reserve was exercised. Considerable stress was given in our news reports to the direction which says that publishers are forbidden to print the new rite without express permission of the Congregation of Sacred Rites. Many inferred from this that no use could be made of the papal permission, unless one possessed an edition of the ceremonial published by the Vatican Press, almost a practical impossibility in this country, owing to the little time intervening between the promulgation of the decree and the occurrence of the Paschal feast. It is difficult to conceive that the Holy See intended with one hand to exercise its largesse, while with the other it clamped down unreasonable and nullifying restrictions. The explanation for forbidding an indiscriminate printing of the text (which we believe to be a valid interpretation) is that the Vatican authorities wished to forestall the printing of copies resembling a typical edition until further corrections or revisions might be made.

Although nothing approaching an official survey has been attempted in the United States, one gains an impression that very few parish churches or seminary and conventual chapels in our land witnessed the solemnization of the *truly blessed night.* We read that here and there the night service was celebrated in a cathedral, parish, monastery, seminary, and mother-house, but the number in the aggregate was quite insignificant. Some of the bishops would not allow it and for good reasons. In the first place, the announcement came out in the daily papers as late as Thursday or Friday before Laetare Sunday, slightly more than three weeks before the occurence of Easter. It was foreseen what confusion might have reigned when requests for information and assistance would have swamped the chancery office, and thus a statement was issued to the effect that the experiment would not be tried in 1951. Msgr. Hellriegel, writing in *Orate Fratres* for April, 1951, wisely anticipated the mind of the American hierarchy, remarking:

> What will happen in this year's holy paschal night (I am writing these lines on Laetare Sunday), I don't know. One thing is certain, and that is, that it is better if *nothing* happens *this* year, unless clergy,

monks, religious and faithful are properly prepared for so divine and sublime a service. . . . I know of no liturgical service about which our people are so *uninformed* and, therefore, so *unprepared* as this, the grandest and most majestic of the entire year. How many are present today on Holy Saturday? Perhaps less than 2 per cent. . . . Therefore, unless the Holy See expects a beginning to be made already *this* year, we would respectfully ask our Most Reverend Ordinaries to postpone its introduction until 1952. In the meantime necessary preparations can be made.

He then outlines a course of instructions for both priests and people on the spirit, meaning, and form of the solemnity.

Europe evidently was better prepared to take the new order of things in stride. At any rate, its organs of expression were quite uninhibited in making vocal sentiments both pro and con. We have examined some of the reviews from England, Germany, Belgium, Italy, and France. Of all these the most comprehensive study appeared in a French periodical, *La maison Dieu,* which devoted practically an entire issue of 176 pages to the matter. Its articles by many representative personages supply not only a great deal of information as to how the decree was received, how it was put into effect, and how successful it was, but they deal above all with the spirit and the import of the restored practice. As one writer observes: "The vigil has helped the people to understand very well that Easter is a most special feast, in fact *the* feast. Not merely because the fact of the Resurrection is the fundament for our faith in an apologetical sense, but far more because the mystery of Christ dead and arisen is the essential mystery of Christianity, since it is the mystery of our baptism, of our own death and resurrection therein, and the essential mystery of our whole Christian life."[3]

The expression of opinion in European reviews was by no means one of unqualified praise and approval. However, the criticisms that were made do not impress us enough to find it necessary to enlarge on them. And even though the experiment was put to the trial in a manner much more widespread in these countries than in our own, we should not think that it was observed generally. Nevertheless, the statistics given for the dioceses in France are quite revealing. In Strasbourg, for example, 200 parishes out of a total of 730 celebrated the night office—more than one fourth; in the Di-

[3] *La maison Dieu*, 2e trimestre, 1951, p. 112.

ocese of Bayonne, 58 out of 404; Diocese of Séez, more than a third; Diocese of Mende, 6 out of 200; Diocese of d'Arras, 50 out of 600; Diocese of Gap, 40 out of 100; Diocese of Poitiers, 30 out of 400; in the Diocese of D'Auch it was not used except by the major seminary; the same for Angers. Commenting on the above, the statistician feels that there was a great timidity about the whole affair.

Episcopal reluctance to launch out into the new arose mainly from a concern as to how the faithful would respond to the initiative of their pastors. Wherefore, it is gratifying to have the following report from a number of parishes regarding the faithful's attendance. At St. Louis of Vincennes, 500 people were present compared to 50 on the previous Holy Saturday; at St. Amand (Marne), more than 130 Communions and a great concourse of people, among them two grandmother octogenarians, as compared to five or six persons the year previous; at the Cathedral of St. Flour, instead of 30 persons on Holy Saturday morning, 350 at the night vigil; at Badaroux in the Diocese of Mende, 150 persons compared to 10 on Saturday. A certain Vicar General who personally experienced the joy of presiding at the night service in a small parish of workingmen (where in past years the curé on Holy Saturday morn performed the service all by his lonesome self, with absolutely no one assisting, not even a single *enfant-de-chœur*), remarks: "Lo and behold, this year the little church was filled in the night." From Meaux came the report that "wherever the night vigil was held, the participation of the faithful was absolutely out of all proportion to that of Saturday morning in preceding years—from 7 to 12 times more in all the parishes." The reports received by the bishop of Séez were unanimous over the success: "magnificent participation at this office . . . an attendance beyond all expectation which in no way detracted from the solemn Mass later on Sunday."[4]

Ecclesiastical authority was likewise apprehensive that assistance at the night vigil might be a cause for people not returning to the solemn Mass on Easter day. Here again the results had all the elements for reassuring *les curés anxieux*. Another point of inquietude pertained to the question of how devoutly this new rite could be carried out for a large number of participants. In answer to this it

[4] *Ibid.*, pp. 61 ff.

was felt that the faithful who came to the Easter vigil were on the whole of a decidedly different calibre from the throngs who present themselves for Midnight Mass on Christmas. *Le lien,* a religious publication from Montbard, notes how quite an original measure was taken—perhaps not to be recommended everywhere—for constituting the membership assembled at a vigil of this kind:

> Children were invited to go to bed. Curiosity seekers were begged to while away the hours in their own homes. That left an unusual group of adult Christians of proper convictions, almost as many men as women, in the neighborhood of 300, that is to say, a number ten times repeated if one compares it with previous years. . . . Everybody followed the office with interest and with sympathetic feeling, with the right kind of sentiments.[5]

Wrote another journalist from Toulouse: "It was a splendid manifestation of Christian faith, both for its dignity and its éclat, as well as for the fervor of those who participated." And from the Cathedral of Soissons came this impression: "It was the experience of all present that there prevailed an atmosphere pregnant with prayer, a participation of all the faithful in the liturgy." A curé of Tarn: "Those who did not come to the vigil expressed their deep regrets, and bespoke their desire to take part next year." A soldier: "Now I can truly believe what has been told us of fraternal charity in the early Church."

The objections to a night service run mainly in the following vein: the fatigue of the clergy; the belief that it will keep people away from the sacred offices on Easter day; the matter of confessions; timidity of priests to embark on a new rite; disappointment on the part of nuns that they will be deprived of Holy Communion for an extra fifteen hours; an idea (a misconception) that a true vigil is a preparatory observance apart from the celebration it prepares for; a romantic nostalgia for the usage of Holy Saturday, consecrated by a tradition of nine centuries, to which objection a certain curé responds: "The restoration has nothing to do with a *tradition.* Its concern is to abandon a collection of antique pieces, in order to let the liturgy have its role of educating the Christian people and having them share in the life-giving mysteries of Christ. Its concern is with the *transitus* from death to life."[6] The most

[5] *Ibid.*, pp. 64 ff. [6] *Ibid.*, p. 74.

valid objection, it seems to us, is the difficulty, in a parish of one priest, of performing the ceremonies without the assistance of other clergy. This real problem could be surmounted by training one or a group of laymen to read the prophecies and to read a carefully prepared explanation of the rites as they are in progress; better yet to call on seminarians for this exceedingly worthwhile purpose. Apropos of all the objections brought forward, *La croix*[7] arrives at this conclusion:

> Among the collection of letters we have received, all which are favorable to the experience came from priests or laity who effectively celebrated the Easter vigil, and all which are unfavorable came from priests who never attempted the experience in question. We have not received a single letter from any priest who did celebrate the Easter vigil who declares himself dissatisfied. . . . The *abstentionists* should now regard themselves dispensed from passing a judgment on this business.[8]

Unfortunately, the sampling of opinion comes almost exclusively from the Church in France. But no other country attempted so comprehensive a survey. At the same time, it is good to have the word from a country where the Church for a long time has been in such terrible travail. We do have information to the effect that in Germany the night vigil was used in almost every parish. It comes to us, not from any official source nor from published statistics, but on the word of a priest who recently spent several months in Germany, and whose competence in making a report on the matter would give us no reason for question. The general reaction and response of the Catholic world is best summed up in a letter written by the Archbishop Secretary of the Congregation of Sacred Rites to the editor of *Orate Fratres,* U.S.A.:

> I thank you for the information you furnished me about the paschal vigil and the favorable response with which the new rite was received. The reports so far received are full of praise and of gratitude to the Holy Father. I congratulate you, moreover, on the work you are carrying on in the field of pastoral liturgy. . . .
>
> ✠ Alfonso Carinci, Archbishop of Seleucia.

Similar letters were received from Fr. Antonelli, O.F.M., secretary of the historical section of the S.C.R., and from the editor of *Ephemerides liturgicae.*[9]

[7] May 22, 1951.

[8] *La maison Dieu, loc. cit.*, p. 75.

[9] *Orate Fratres,* June, 1951.

HISTORY

A Christian vigil owes its origin to the example of our Lord, who often spent the whole night through in converse with His heavenly Father, and who commanded His disciples to watch and pray in like manner. The early Church, consequently, knew of a vigil service almost from the beginning, at first during the night which ushered in the Lord's day, and later for the more important feasts. It was believed that Christ would come again in the course of the night hours. And though He did not appear in an historical *Parousia*, they were never totally disappointed, because He did actually come into their midst in the Eucharist which terminated the vigil.

In one form or another, the Easter vigil is as ancient as the feast itself. Tertullian (born in the second century) says that this holy night is so solemn that all Christians of his time were obliged to assist thereat. The Church of the Orient has clung steadfastly to this sacred tradition, and one of the joys of celebrating Easter in Rome has been the opportunity afforded to participate in the night service and Mass at the Russian church, a heart-warming experience never to be forgotten. It is believed, incidentally, that the newly restored practice in the Roman rite may serve in the rapprochement between Rome and the dissidents of the Orient.

Toward the end of the third century, it was still the custom universally to keep watch throughout the night, so that the vigil closed with the offering of the Eucharist at the dawn of Easter morn. In the fourth century, however, a change set in slowly and surely. Jungmann, by a thoroughgoing examination of the writings and sermons of Augustine, Jerome, Leo the Great, and other patristic authors, delineates along historical lines the tendency to anticipate the vigil of the Pasch, so that by the later part of the fifth century the practice was in vogue of bringing the service to a close by midnight or long before the grey of dawn, whereas the vigils of Christmas and Epiphany were still prolonged till the morning hours.[10] From the sixth century onward, step by step, the service began earlier and earlier on Holy Saturday. The sacramentaries of that time direct that Mass is to start when the first star has appeared

[10] Cf. Jungmann: "Die Vorverlegung der Ostervigil seit dem christlichen Altertum," in *Liturgisches Jahrbuch*, 1 Band, 1951.

in the sky, namely after six in the evening. Similar rubrics are repeated in manuscripts which date from the ninth and tenth centuries. By the twelfth century, as Honorius von Augustodunum explicitly testifies, the vigil was begun in time to have the Mass celebrated at the hour of none—three in the afternoon.[11] This was the hour appointed for Mass during Lent, ever since the close of the early Christian era. A final phase was reached in the late Middle Ages, when zeal for penance and fasting has considerably cooled, to say nothing of a waning enthusiasm for spending long hours of evening or night in a vigilary service in church. And thus to obviate a late fast and abstinence on the last day of Lent, the vigil was set back to the morning hours of Holy Saturday, where it has remained an established custom for the Western Church ever since the time of Pius V.

This in broad outline is the historical development of the Easter vigil, and several reasons for the change have been indicated above. If one asks the historians for the main reason why a vigil at nighttime fell into increasing disfavor, the answer usually given goes as follows. Ecclesiastical authorities, they say, became alarmed over the danger and abuses which could so easily and sometimes did creep in when the service was held under cover of darkness. There were always on the loose some revelers and even more sinister characters who could be a threat to the peace and piety which ought to prevail on this blessed night. And they point out that St. Jerome had to warn Christian mothers not to allow their daughters to be separated from their side by so much as a finger's breath when they went abroad to assist at the nocturnal celebration.

Surely this argument carried much weight in a period when Christian morals were so very strict, but it is far from being an adequate explanation on several scores. It fails to explain why other feasts continued to have a night vigil long after the Easter vigil at night had fallen into desuetude. Christmas, for example, never lost the custom of having Mass celebrated at midnight. Moreover, it is of no value in ascertaining why the Easter service is anticipated ever earlier and earlier, until finally its hour is set for the morning of Holy Saturday.

We venture to argue that the factor which contributed above all others to the historical development noted above, was the dis-

[11] Cf. Jungmann, *op. cit.*

appearance of the catechumenate once the Church had grown to adulthood, along with the fact that gradually there were fewer and fewer adult baptisms. For the vigil celebration of old was primarily a baptismal celebration, with its entire ceremonial and symbolism ordered to impressing the catechumens with the truth that the Paschal solemnity is the renewal of Christ's death and resurrection, and that baptism is their participation in His death and victory. Once the character of a baptismal celebration lost its force, enthusiasm for this vigil quickly waned. So that now in the new rite of restoration, great emphasis is laid on the renewal of baptismal vows, a substitute in a way for baptism itself. Nor will the restored vigil receive its full import and impact until actual baptism becomes one of its features, either the baptism of converts —which the Church still desires as an ideal on Easter and Pentecost—or the baptism of one or several infants, if this is not too impractical.[12] Limitation on space for this article acts as a deterrent in going any further into the history, but the whole story can be known only from a consideration of how the official liturgy of the Church suffered during the Middle Ages; the effects, as an instance, of the upheaval and long-persisting disturbances in Rome, when the mother and examplar of all churches, with her onetime magnificent basilicas and inspiring liturgical observances, ceased to be the leaven in this respect for the outflung posts of Christendom.

SPIRIT AND IMPORT

Apart from other considerations, a desideratum in restoring the Easter vigil to the night hours is a greater participation of the people, so states the decree. Since Holy Saturday is no longer a holiday, we know only too well what has happened to the morning office—a most miserable attendance at the most solemn liturgy of the entire year on the part of the faithful, and a sometimes perfunctory celebration on the part of priests. Formerly, on the contrary, when the day enjoyed the nature of a holiday for all, it was a justified hope that the laity would turn out *en masse* for an afternoon or morning service. As early as the fourth century, the Emperor Valentinian II (375-92) had decreed that every day in Holy

[12] Permission might be given to administer all preliminary ceremonies sometime beforehand, so that only the act of baptizing and the ceremonies following would form a part of the vigil service.

Week would have the same rank as Sundays, precisely so that the people could be present at all sacred functions of that week.[13] His action was later upheld and strengthened by similar legislation on the part of local councils, and in the year 1232 by a decree of Gregory IX (1227-41), who caused the days of Holy Week to become holy days of obligation for the universal Church. These laws were in force throughout mediaeval times and longer, in fact until the year 1642, when Urban VIII (1623-44) removed Holy Saturday along with many other days from the list of obligatory festivals.

Wherever the liturgical and Eucharistic renascence of our day has sunk its roots deep, one could expect an earnest longing and clamor for a revivified Easter feast. There one would necessarily find a growing dissatisfaction with the present state of things. It was this, as the recent decree recognizes, that prompted bishops of many dioceses, in some cases the united episcopate of an entire country, to petition the Holy See to allow the vigil observance at nighttime. Yet even as late as 1948, we find Rome returning a negative response to the very request when it came from the Diocese of Cambrai. Thus it occasioned no little surprise when the Holy Father did grant the permission in 1951, even though a year earlier the hierarchy of both France and Germany, along with many Benedictine abbots and a representative lot of priests, religious, and laymen, renewed the petition which hitherto had met consistently with refusal.

Easter is the feast of feasts, of which every Sunday in the liturgical year is a miniature, and from which every other feast day obtains its significance and its measure of grace. No one would gainsay that a revivified Paschal solemnity would play a decisive role in the rechristianization of our present society. "The sacred liturgy is the primary and indispensable source of the true Christian spirit." These words of Blessed Pius X cannot be repeated too often. If we desire to restore Easter in our modern world, to have it more fully impart joy and sanctification, to let it satisfy the instinctive aspirations of the man and the Christian, we must proceed along the lines of tradition. No *ersatz* devotion and piety will replace the liturgical and traditional form which the Church has con-

[13] Cf. *Ephemerides Liturgicae*, 65 (1951), Fasc. 1—Supplementum.

secrated for the Paschal observance. It is only when the liturgy is viewed as a form that has lost some of its savor, something that has to be done somehow and gotten over with, that pastors give it a perfunctory obedience, and concentrate their efforts on para-liturgical and non-liturgical substitutes. Viewed in this light, here is an example of what can happen to the traditional offices of Holy Week. In a certain parish in the U. S., the Mass of the Presanctified on Good Friday is celebrated, of course, but in a desultory fashion and before a very small congregation of worshippers. All emphasis is placed rather on the *Tre Ore* service in the afternoon, and it is this service which parishioners are urged to attend. And they do.

It is not enough that the mystery of Easter be somehow celebrated, but the language or symbol in which it is presented must have a universal intelligibility and a universal attraction. The symbols long tried by the Church and never found wanting are the symbols contained in the official office for the night vigil. Easter is the re-enactment and re-presentation of the work of Redemption, the passage of sinful mankind from death to resurrection and participation in God's life, a transition from unmitigated sorrow to unmixed joy. The symbols of the new fire and of the great paschal candle representing Christ, from which everyone present, according to the new rite, receives a light for his own smaller candle, dramatically tell the story of how the uncreated Life and Light of the hidden Godhead is passed on, through Christ whom the Father has revealed, in created grace and light upon men, that they may be enlightened and have a share in the light of their Creator. We recognize in these signs the death of Jesus and His resurrection, the victory of Light over the darkness of sin. The prophecies which follow from the Old Testament tell in the form of type of the New Covenant realization by means of the sacraments of baptism and Eucharist. And lastly the consecration of the baptismal font (the sacred and fruitful womb of Mother Church), the sacrament of regeneration (or at least the renewal of baptismal vows), and the climax of the whole rite in the Eucharistic oblation and banquet—these signify and make present Christ's death, burial, and resurrection, and also signify and bring about through grace our death and burial and our rising up as a new creature. The kernel of sal-

vation is preserved and communicated within this sacramental shell. The liturgy of Easter night is the sacred act wherein Christ the Highpriest, under visible signs, accomplishes in objective reality the work for which He was sent, wherein the mystery of the new and eternal covenant is perfected, wherein God and mankind are bound together in the one Mediator, Jesus Christ, King of kings and Lord of lords.

(*To be continued*)

PHILIP T. WELLER

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

A NEW DECREE

After Fr. Weller's article, "Easter Eve," was already in print, the Sacred Congregation of Rites issued a new decree, dated Jan. 11, 1952, extending for three years the faculty of celebrating the Easter vigil in place of the ordinary Holy Saturday liturgy, and containing a number of practical directives on this subject. Fr. Weller has been kind enough to bring together a translation of the decree and explanations of the various directions given in this new document but not in the previous decree. This "Supplement" to the second part of Fr. Weller's article has been sent to the printer, and will be incorporated into the April issue of *The American Ecclesiastical Review*.

The April number will be in the hands of our subscribers early enough to be of use to them if they plan to celebrate the Vigil according to the prescriptions of the new decree.

J. C. F.

THE NEED OF KNOWLEDGE OF FAITH

That Catholics should have a knowledge of *the faith*—that is, of the teachings of the Church—is axiomatic; but the subject with which we are concerned in this article is the necessity of a knowledge of *faith itself*, the theological virtue mentioned by St. Paul, when he said: "So there abide faith, hope and charity, these three; but the greatest of these is charity."[1] It is an unquestionable fact that the majority of Catholics are not sufficiently acquainted with the nature of divine faith, its excellence and necessity, and particularly some of the practical problems connected with the exercise and the manifestation of this virtue. This may be due to a misapplication of the revealed doctrine that charity is the greatest of the three theological virtues. It is possible that in centering their attention on charity, many Catholics neglect to give to faith the appreciation that it deserves. At any rate, it is vitally important that they be instructed by their spiritual shepherds in the nature of this virtue, in its essential qualities and in the proper practice of faith in daily life. There is no dearth of material for such instructions in the official pronouncements of the Church and in the writings of Catholic theologians.

No more appropriate principle could serve as the starting-point for an instruction on faith than the statement of the Council of Trent in its Decree on Justification, that "faith is the beginning of man's salvation, the foundation and the root of all justification."[2] Actually, the primary purpose of this chapter of the Decree was to condemn the Lutheran doctrine that man is justified by faith alone—a doctrine which the Reformers endeavored to prove from such scriptural texts as the assertion of St. Paul that justice comes "through faith in Jesus Christ upon all who believe."[3] The purpose of this eighth chapter of the Decree was to explain that man is said to be justified by faith in the sense that faith is the *initial step* in the supernatural process toward the attainment of sanctifying grace. This same doctrine was proclaimed in the ninth canon approved at the same session: "If any one shall say that the sinner is justified by faith alone . . . let him be anathema."[4] However, the pronouncement of the Council, though primarily intended to declare what faith cannot do, furnishes a valuable statement of the

[1] *I Cor.* 13:13. [2] *DB.* 801. [3] *Rom.* 3:22. [4] *DB.* 819.

Catholic Church on the importance and the necessity of this virtue as the foundation of man's supernatural life, "without which it is impossible to please God."[5]

That the word "faith" is used in various senses in the New Testament cannot be denied. Indeed, we can readily admit that the idea of *confidence* is frequently connoted by this word, which is employed about 240 times in the New Testament. But the interpretation traditionally given by the Catholic Church of faith as *belief* is surely predominant.[6]

In other words, *faith* as Catholics understand it, and as Christian tradition proposes it, is a perfection of the intellect, a supernatural gift of God, enabling man to believe as true the doctrines of divine revelation, not because he perceives their truth through the light of reason but solely because of the wisdom and the truthfulness of God who has revealed them. Such was the definition of faith proposed by the Vatican Council—"the supernatural virtue by which, through the inspiration and aid of God's grace, we believe as true the things revealed by Him, not on account of the intrinsic truth of the subjects perceived by the natural light of reason, but on account of the authority of God Himself revealing, who can neither be deceived nor deceive."[7]

That faith is essentially an intellectual perfection cannot be emphasized too strongly for Catholics of the present day, because "faith" as generally proposed by non-Catholics is something that pertains, at least in great measure, to the will or even to the sensitive faculties. The view of Luther, that faith is nothing else than personal trust in the sin-forgiving grace of God has been modified in the course of time among the majority of Protestants to the extent of admitting a greater measure of intellectual activity in the exercise of faith,[8] yet in Protestant theology "faith" still includes the fiduciary factor ascribed to it by the Reformers. Thus, we have the statement of Theodore M. Greene of Princeton: "Faith may be defined as whole-hearted belief on the basis of evidence, but not wholly conclusive evidence, and of interpretation which is reasonable, but which falls short of absolute proof. On this view, faith is never wholly blind . . . nor is it ever completely enlightened."[9]

[5] *Heb.* 11:5. [6] Harent, S., "Foi," *DTC*, 6, 75. [7] *DB*, 1789.

[8] Cf. *Hastings' Encyclopedia of Religion and Ethics* (New York, 1922), 5, 691 ff.

[9] *The Christian Answer* (New York, 1945), p. 76.

In other words, outside the Catholic Church the concept of faith includes, to a greater or less degree, the notion of trust inspired by religious feeling, an instinctive turning to God, even though this attitude is not preceded by an adequate logical process of reason.

In view of the prevalence of such ideas among non-Catholics, Catholics should realize that in discussing the subject of faith with those not of their creed there may be confusion and ambiguity unless there is explicit understanding as to what is meant by faith. Every Catholic capable of grasping the intellectual process involved in the making of an act of faith should have a knowledge of this process; and one need not be a trained theologian to possess a very satisfactory understanding of this process and to perceive how logical and reasonable an act of faith really is. In the making of an act of faith as the Catholic Church explains it, the opposite extremes of fideism and rationalism are avoided. On the one hand, the preambles of faith and the motives of credibility (proofs from reason and history that God exists, that He is all-wise and all truthful, that He has spoken through Jesus Christ) give *certain* proof that the Christian revelation is the message of God to all men. The Church has emphatically condemned the opinion that mere *probability* of the fact of revelation suffices for the intellectual preparation for the act of faith.[10] On the other hand, in eliciting the act of faith the intellect does not base its assent on the motives of credibility; the sole motive of faith is the authority of God revealing. The judgment of credibility ("these doctrines are certainly revealed") and the judgment of credentity ("I am bound to believe these doctrines") are intrinsically natural acts; the assent of faith ("I believe these doctrines on the authority of God") is essentially supernatural. The transition from the former to the latter is explained in different ways by theologians,[11] but all explanations show that no violence is done to human reason, no unreasonable demand is made on man's intelligence in the eliciting of an act of faith. An act of the will is indeed necessary to command the intellect to accept the truths of revelation, since they are not intrinsically evident; yet this act of the will is not a blind, sentimental urge or a religious sense based on the need of the divine, as the Modernists conceive it.[12] For this act of the will is itself guided by the intellect proposing the acceptance of divine revelation on

[10] *DB*, 1171, 1622-27. [11] Cf. *DTC*, *art. cit.*, 6, 469-512. [12] *DB*, 2074.

account of God's authority as a *good*. That a person may elicit an act of faith, actual grace, aiding both the intellect and the will, is absolutely necessary, for it is an intrinsically supernatural act. However, the will is free to believe or not to believe, even after the motives of credibility have been adequately proposed and accepted; hence, a person may refuse to make an act of faith even though he has made the judgment of credibility. In the words of Garrigou-Lagrange: "Some persons, like the pharisees, when the preaching of the Gospel, confirmed by miracles, is proposed to them, resist internal grace, and do not sincerely desire salvation. Hence, on seeing the miracles, they can evidently judge of the credibility of the preaching, and even know of their obligation to believe, and yet through perversity be unwilling to believe."[13]

However, though grace is necessary in order that a person may elicit an act of faith, it would seem evident that anyone who arrives at the judgment of credibility and the judgment of credentity will receive sufficient grace to make an act of faith. For God will not refuse a person the grace to perform an action which his conscience tells him must be performed. This principle was enunciated by Pope Pius IX in his Encyclical *Qui pluribus* of Nov. 9, 1846: "Human reason, clearly and evidently recognizing by these most firm and lucid arguments that God is the author of the faith, can go no further, but, casting aside every difficulty and doubt *must* give full assent to the faith, since it recognizes as certain that whatever the faith proposes to be believed and done by men has been communicated by God."[14] The Sovereign Pontiff clearly implied that the supernatural grace to make an act of faith is given to all who arrive at the conviction that the Christian revelation is a divine message and must be accepted, inasmuch as he stated that all who come to this conviction *must* make the act of faith.

Not only is the Catholic meaning of "faith" different from that given to it by most non-Catholics, but even in Catholic literature and speech this word is accepted in various senses; and Catholics should be aware of this fact so that their concepts may be clear when they speak or read about faith. Thus, preachers and ascetical writers are inclined to include under the general term of "faith" those virtues which are essential to a good Christian life. In other

[13] Garrigou-Lagrange, *De revelatione* (Rome, 1932), p. 285.
[14] *DB*, 1639.

words, by "faith" they sometimes mean a *living* faith. Indeed in some of the passages of the New Testament in which "faith" appears, it may be used in this sense.[15] However, Catholics should realize, and Catholic preachers should emphasize, that faith in the proper sense is a speculative virtue, which can exist without charity. Even this faith is a gift of God, as the Vatican Council asserted.[16] At the same time, in order to exist in a perfect state, faith must be joined with charity, so that it is a *living* or *formed* faith.[17]

To understand faith properly one must distinguish clearly between the act and the habit of this virtue. Both in Sacred Scripture and the decisions of the Church the same word is used for both aspects of faith, and one must sometimes examine the context in order to find out the particular sense intended. If the distinction is not observed, one might conclude that there is a contradiction in the Church's teaching. Thus, while the Council of Trent taught that "faith is the beginning of man's salvation,"[18] Pope Clement XI condemned the teaching of Quesnel, that "faith is the first grace, and the font of all other graces."[19] There was no contradiction because Trent referred primarily to the *act* of faith, whereas Quesnel was speaking of the *habit* of faith. In his condemnation of the Jansenistic Synod of Pistoia, Pope Pius VI clearly pointed out this erroneous interpretation of *faith* by denouncing the proposition that "faith from which the series of graces begins, and through which, as by the first voice we are called to salvation and to the Church, is the excellent virtue by which men are called and are the faithful," stating that it was already condemned in the teachings of Quesnel.[20] The false conclusion which Quesnel and the Jansenists of Pistoia had drawn from their confusion between the act and the habit was that no one receives a supernatural grace unless he is already in possession of the habit of faith. Now, while it would seem that before the grace by which one is called to the *act* of faith, no intrinsically supernatural actual graces are given,[21] undoubtedly in the process of the justification of an infidel, supernatural actual graces are given before he receives the *habit* of faith with the infusion of sanctifying grace.

[15] Cf. *DTC*, *art. cit.*, 74. [16] *DB*, 1791; cf. 838.
[17] Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* (Paris, 1938), 1, n. 717.
[18] *DB*, 801. [19] *DB*, 1377. [20] *DB*, 1522.
[21] Cf. Van Noort, *De gratia Christi* (Hilversum, 1934), n. 131, note.

Hence, the infant receives in Baptism the habit of faith, although he is as yet unable to make an act of faith. On the other hand, the pagan to whom the Christian revelation is preached may and should elicit an act of faith; yet he does not receive the virtue itself until he is baptized or elicits an act of divine charity or perfect contrition.

Catholics should also be aware that there is a distinction between divine faith and what is called ecclesiastical faith. The latter is sometimes called mediately divine faith,[22] and signifies the act whereby we accept a doctrine not contained in the deposit of revelation, but in some way connected with it, such as the declaration of Pope Leo XIII that Anglican Orders are invalid[23] or an official decree of canonization. The formal object or motive of this latter type of assent is the divinely guaranteed infallibility of the Church, whereas the formal object of divine faith is always the authority of God Himself. The practical application of this distinction is that Catholics should be frequently reminded that in eliciting an act of divine faith they should base their acceptance on God's authority, not on the teaching of the Church. Perhaps, as Van Noort states, it does not make much difference in practice if the faithful say that they believe a certain doctrine because the Church teaches it, since they mean the right thing,[24] yet it is always better to instruct Catholics in the exact truth. The Church is, indeed, the infallible proponent of divine revelation; but the teaching authority of the Church is not the basic motive for the acceptance of the truths of revelation. That motive can be only the authority of God, who can neither be deceived nor deceive.

The possession of the virtue of faith is not necessarily connected with actual membership in the Catholic Church. A non-Catholic, sincerely desirous of doing God's will and believing in general all that God has revealed can have the virtue of divine faith, at least if he has explicit faith in the four fundamental truths—God's existence, divine retribution in the future life, the Holy Trinity and the Incarnation. Such a person actually has implicit faith in all that the Catholic Church teaches. However, he is not an actual member of the Catholic Church, though he is rightly said to be affiliated with the Catholic Church by implicit desire. This distinction is important in view of the common custom among Cath-

[22] Cf. Van Noort, *De fontibus revelationis* (Bussum, 1920), nn. 247-50.
[23] *DB*, 1966. [24] Van Noort, *De fontibus revelationis*, n. 190.

clics of saying of a person that he does not possess "the faith" because he is not actually a member of the true Church of Christ. It should be noted that we are here considering the case of one who was brought up from childhood in heresy or as an adult received instructions from an heretical source. Whether it is possible for a Catholic to renounce his allegiance to the Catholic Church without being guilty of a grave formal sin against the virtue of faith will be considered in a subsequent article.

Catholics should be able to distinguish between divine faith and divine-Catholic faith. The former must be given to any truth revealed by God, once a person has sufficient certainty of the fact of revelation. This would extend to private revelations, which must be accepted by those for whom they are made, and may be accepted by other persons, though there is no obligation on the part of others to accept them.[25] Divine faith is also given to particular truths contained in the deposit of public revelation which an individual clearly perceives to be revealed, though they have not been proposed as such by the infallible magisterium of the Church.[26] Divine-Catholic faith is given to doctrines revealed by God and proposed as such by the Church, either by solemn definition or by the ordinary and universal magisterium.[27] Because some of the truths of divine revelation have come to the explicit consciousness of the Church only after the lapse of a considerable period of time, such as the doctrines of Mary's Immaculate Conception and her Assumption, an increase in the *explicit* object of divine-Catholic faith is possible, although the content of public revelation admits of no objective addition since the death of the last apostle. It is only by the pertinacious denial or doubt of a doctrine of divine-Catholic faith that one becomes guilty of the specific sin of heresy,[28] though the deliberate denial or doubt of any revealed doctrine, once a person has sufficient certainty that it is revealed, constitutes a grave sin of infidelity and ejects the infused virtue of faith from the soul, if it has been present.

In explaining the act of faith, some theologians make a fine distinction, which is helpful to emphasize the precise nature of this

[25] Cf. Finlay, *Divine Faith* (New York, 1917), 55 ff.

[26] Van Noort, *De fontibus revelationis*, n. 207, note; Herrmann, *Institutiones theol. dogmaticae* (Paris, 1926), 1, n. 31.

[27] *DB*, 1792; Can. 1323. [28] Can. 1325, §2.

exalted virtue. They distinguish between faith in the broad sense (*fides late dicta*) and faith in the strict sense (*fides stricte dicta*). The attitude of one who makes an act of the former is: "I believe the statement of the speaker because *it is evident to me* that he is neither deceived nor deceiving." The attitude of one who makes an act of faith in the strict sense is: "I believe the statement of the speaker because *he is neither deceived nor deceiving.*" The distinction is very important, especially in its application to divine faith. Only faith in the strict sense merits to be accounted as the theological virtue. One who would accept the doctrines of divine revelation merely because of the clear evidence that God is all-wise and all-truthful and has made a revelation would be making an intellectual act based on the motives of credibility—and that would not be an act of faith, save in the sense in which St. James says: "The devils also believe."[29] In the case of one who makes an act of faith in the strict sense, the motives of credibility are a necessary *condition* to lead him to the judgment of credibility; but in eliciting the act of faith the *motive* of his assent (with the aid of divine grace) is not the *evidence* that God is all-wise and all-truthful, but the *attributes* of God's wisdom and truthfulness themselves.[30]

Finally, Catholics should be aware of the difference between faith and the intellectual act known as religious assent. This latter term signifies the acceptance of a doctrine taught authoritatively by an official teacher or teaching body in the Church, but not with the use of the infallible magisterium. Such would be a doctrine proposed by the Holy Office or the Biblical Commission. The Pope himself can teach in this manner, and frequently does so in his Encyclical Letters. Merely because a doctrine of this kind is not infallibly proposed does not mean that Catholics may reject it or subject it to criticism as they might the teaching of a private theologian. For, as Pope Pius XII asserted in *Humani generis:* "Nor must it be thought that what is expounded in Encyclical Letters does not of itself demand consent, since in writing such Letters the Popes do not exercise the supreme power of their teaching authority. For these matters are taught with the ordinary teaching authority, of which it is true to say 'He who heareth you, heareth

[29] *James* 2:19.

[30] Van Noort, *De fontibus revelationis*, n. 300.

Me'."[31] An act of religious assent proceeds from the virtues of religion and obedience rather than from divine faith.[32]

Evidently, then, there is need for Catholics to have a clear and precise notion of what is meant by faith, in view of the various senses in which this word is understood, and of the many erroneous notions prevalent today about the nature of faith. In fact, it is not unusual to read vehement attacks on the very idea of admitting doctrines above the direct perception of the senses and natural reason. For example, at the dedication of the University of Rochester's psychiatric clinic on March 31, 1949, Homer W. Smith, professor of physiology at New York University made the statement: "The unwarranted claim to knowledge of certain properties not available to empirical examination, such as God, transcendent good and evil, absolute values, future reward and punishment, and the like, has in practice, whatever it might have accomplished in theory, done more to retard man's intellectual and social development than any other misadventure that has ever befallen him."[33]

However, even those who admit the existence of God and revelation entertain very indefinite notions about faith, generally designating it by such terms as "inner experience," the "vision of spiritual values," "the active response of the whole man to things of the spirit," etc. Hence it is vitally important that Catholics clearly understand and be prepared to explain the concept of faith in the sense accepted by their Church. The obligation of instructing the laity in this matter rests on bishops and priests, to whom has been committed the responsibility of providing their flocks with the spiritual nourishment of Christ's doctrine. No more important subject can be chosen for the detailed instruction of the faithful in our own times than the nature of divine faith.

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.
The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

[31] *AAS*, 42 (1950), 468.

[32] Cf. Benard, E., "The Doctrinal Value of the Ordinary Teaching of the Holy Father," in *Proceedings of the Sixth Annual Convention of the Catholic Theological Society of America* (New York, 1951), 78-107; and Fenton, Msgr. Joseph C., "The *Humani generis* and the Holy Father's Ordinary Magisterium," in *AER*, CXXV, 1 (July, 1951), 53-62; and also Msgr. Fenton's article, "The Doctrinal Authority of Papal Encyclicals," in *AER*, CXXI, 2, 3 (Aug. and Sept., 1949), 136-50; 210-20.

[33] *Washington Post*, April 1, 1949, p. 6.

LIGHTNING STRIKES TWICE

"History repeats itself" has a familiar ring to most ears. The foundation for the ready acceptance of the saying loses none of its firmness in the publicity which has accompanied the naming of General Mark Clark as United States Ambassador to the Vatican State. The chorus of speculation over the possibility of President Truman sending the general as an interim appointee, pending approval by the Senate, abruptly halted with the recognition that "a forgotten law of 1870" forbade Clark taking the commission as long as he retained his service rank. Strangely, the two noteworthy applications of this legislation in the eight decades of its existence have each had a religious implication, never conceived by those who wrote the measure. That "history repeats itself" should never be questioned when the striking parallel of the two cases is recalled.

In the first instance one of the acute problems confronting Ulysses S. Grant upon his election to the presidency in 1868 was that of the Indian. The Homestead Act of 1862 had opened the lands of the west to all who would settle them, and the first transcontinental railroad soon was to render frontier territory even more attractive. The resulting torrent of invaders of his hunting ground was a constant irritant to the red man, and the measures employed to pacify him had been scandalous failures. At best the Indian was dissatisfied; often in disgust he took to the warpath. On the battlefield the crushing superiority of the white race in numbers and in arms had proved lamentably deficient. With probable correctness it was officially estimated in 1870 that every dead Indian had cost the taxpayer a million dollars—and still the braves had not been subdued. At the same time the payment of cash annuities or the issuance of rations merely degraded the Indians, while the stench of corruption arising from the appeasement program was discernible to the most jaded nostril. Eighty years ago the threat of foreign invasion was non-existent, but the domestic dissension between the two races demanded a solution.

Perhaps inspired by the name of the Society of Friends and recalling William Penn's happy relations with the Indians of his colony, a Washington newspaper in 1867 had suggested that the descendents of the first Quakers be called upon to handle the

Indians. The proposal must have appealed to the Friends too, for in January following the election of 1868 two different groups of Quakers had interviews with the President-to-be. Each delegation offered its services for the domestic issue of the day. Later Grant became known for lending a ready ear to whomever he heard, so the fine reception reported by spokesmen for each branch of Quakers would have caused no surprise several years afterwards. Apparently no other adviser counteracted the impression made by the Friends, for even before his inauguration Grant requested that the Quakers submit the names of members who had been approved for the office of Indian agent. During the summer the men nominated were assigned by the Indian department, with tribes in Kansas and the present state of Oklahoma going to the Orthodox Friends, while Nebraska Indians were entrusted to the Hicksite or Liberal Friends. Congress did not convene until more than a year after its selection at the polls, so it was December, 1869, before Grant sent his first annual message to the two houses and used one section of it for an explanation of the move. First he recalled the mutually friendly attitude between Penn and the Indians, which has been idealized by a frieze in the rotunda of the Capitol. This tradition and the peacefulness of the Quakers themselves impelled him, the President declared, to entrust *a few of the Indian reservations* to their care.

In his address Grant made no mention of considering any other religious denomination for similar work, though Catholics for instance had made the Indian missions a sparkling jewel among the Church's achievements. But at that moment the former Union commander had something quite different in mind. About 25,000 red men had been assigned to the Society of Friends; all the rest—variously estimated between 300,000 and 400,000—were to be given to military officers, then awaiting orders because of a reduction of the army from 34,000 to 30,000. As had been done for the Friends, so an appeal also was made to the people to give these army officers full confidence as Indian agents.

The "featherbedding" of his former comrades in arms seems to have been entirely Grant's own idea. Strictly as a party measure no effective opposition could have been mustered to the proposal. The Forty-First Congress in this first session of 1869 included only nine Democratic senators and seventy-five Democratic representa-

tives. While the legislative body was thus virtually one-party, nevertheless two factors combined to hamstring Grant's provision for his former "buddies." Incontestable as was the President's personal popularity, he had already antagonized Congress by treating the members as underlings. Though the approval of the Senate was required for the confirmation of Indian agents, as it is of ambassadors, the President had consulted very few members of the upper chamber—and these only his personal friends. On the other hand Congress had effectively usurped the functions of the chief executive during Andrew Johnson's administration and was not inclined to surrender them to a President who refused to observe the ordinary protocol. The answer to Grant's proposal was quick and decisive. On Jan. 21, 1870, about six weeks after the executive announcement, an act was incorporated in the statute books which forbade army officers to accept civil positions. The following July 15 Congress made the legislation more definitive in the passage of an appropriation bill. To avoid loss of their commissions some five thousand army officers vacated posts which they had taken and some fifty Indian agencies were open.

Since even his own Secretary of State, the sagacious Hamilton Fish, confessed he never fathomed the mind of the President, speculation now about his reaction to the congressional rebuff is useless. Probably he sat in one of his frozen silences, vigorously puffing one of the day's twenty or more long black cigars. Indian agents were needed whom the aroused Senate would confirm, and the idea of the Friends naming a few was expanded to other religious bodies, some of whom never before had participated in Indian work. No protest rang out at the meagre number given to the Catholic Church, probably because most of the bishops were then attending the Vatican Council and were unaware of the allotment of the reservations. A formal announcement of the Indian "Peace Policy" was included in Grant's second annual message to Congress the following December. Catholic newspapers were too preoccupied with the seizure of the Papal States and Rome itself by the forces of Victor Emmanuel to comment upon the implications—if they were realized! From the far northwest Bishop Francis Blanchet, who had been a pioneer missionary and had many Indians in his Nesqually diocese, was expressing a hope rather than a conviction when he exclaimed: "With great joy do we hail the

happy and long desired news!" Alas, the fond expectations of fair recognition of past Catholic concern for the Indian were rudely dissipated. Not design but simply pressing need brought about an organization in Washington to fight for the rights of the Church. In 1874 the Bureau of Catholic Indian Missions was authorized by Archbishop James Roosevelt Bayley of Baltimore, and to this day it continues the work for both Indian and Negro missions.

Thus eighty years ago hasty congressional legislation forced Grant to give the care of the Indians to religious societies. Because in 1870 American bishops were worried about the appropriation of papal territory and the virtual imprisonment of the Holy Father little notice was immediately taken of the effect upon the Church which stemmed from that law. Once Grant's "Peace Policy" was abandoned, only nominal advertence to the existence of the statute was made in the exceptions which were granted to General George C. Marshall and Omar N. Bradley. Meanwhile freedom and sovereignty, snatched from the Vatican State in that same year of 1870, had been regained and grew in prestige and glory. Not until an ambassador was proposed from the United States to that same Vatican State did the law of 1870 erupt from the silence of its unnoticed tomb. Who can deny that "history repeats itself"?

PETER J. RAHILL

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

A QUEST OF THOUGHTS

PART III

THE AMERICAN REVOLUTION

In the long record of history the American Revolution may not hold a very large place. There is evidence of this already in the immense literature of the war between the states and the comparative lack of interest in the revolution. So too, is it significant that Lincoln steadily gains precedence over Washington as the first of Americans. Again, July 4th, Independence Day, year by year keeps less and less of its original character and purpose.

More important than this is the fact that the revolution did not really make us independent of England. We seized by violent means the political independence that Canada gained by peaceful measures. Yet it can be argued that in some ways we have been a member of the British commonwealth of nations along with Canada. For instance we formulated an instrument of foreign policy, addressed to Czarist Russia and designed to govern our relations with foreign powers within the new world. Yet when England took the Falkland Islands from Argentina, we acquiesced. So also we agreed to her sovereignty over British Columbia. We could not tolerate a Cuba owned by Spain, but the British Bahamas were not thought of as a base of enemy attack.

Most important and significant of all is the fact that twice within a quarter of a century we have saved Britain and her empire, fighting for them, and paying for the war in blood and treasure. England's battle in the two world wars—or better, throughout the one long struggle—has been our battle. We have fought as one member of the English-speaking group of nations more effectively to preserve Britain the Empire than even Britain herself.

To say this is not to object to history and condemn these facts as something evil. In the long record the American Revolution may be judged to be a minor episode in the history of the British and American peoples. Perhaps men will finally conclude that, like all revolutions, ours ought never to have run its course in violence. For its good effects could have been brought about by more peace-

ful means and some of its results have been evil even if we do not advert to them or mention them in our school books.

THE JEWS

What anti-Semitism is, and what its causes and occasions are, are matters too involved to set down easily and quickly.

It is more profitable for us to ask ourselves what are some of the qualities that characterize the Jews as a group, and that are worth envying and imitating.

The Jews are purposive. They want to get ahead in life. They know that they will meet obstacles and opposition. They give evidence early in life of having certain goals and of being determined to reach them.

The Jews are energetic. They know that they must exert themselves if they are to reach their individual objectives. It is not enough to have ends in view; one must take the means that are necessary to reach those ends. They recognize this truth and act upon it.

The Jews are industrious. To be industrious is something more than to be energetic. It is a sort of constant, steady expenditure of energy. As a group, the Jews are industrious, even though they include their share of men and women who do not believe in hard work.

The Jews are temperate. Not many of them are ascetics, but most of them are temperate, especially where liquor is concerned. It would be interesting certainly, and very likely instructive as well, to have statistics showing the prevalence of alcoholics among the Jews and the other racial groups.

The Jews are intellectually alert. They are interested in ideas. They have the highest respect for education and its advantages. They read. They write. They do not hesitate to express themselves. They think and they express their thoughts.

The Jews are interested in music and art. They buy pictures and other works of art, if they have the money. They attend concerts. They learn to play the violin and piano and other instruments. They compose music. They are proud of their artists of the stage and concert platform and attend their performances. They are an art-producing as well as an art-consuming people.

They are generous. They contribute largely to their own and other charities. They have money, but they give it away as well.

They are loyal. They help one another. They are united against attack. The rich Jew and the poor Jew, the radical and the conservative, the orthodox and the atheist all hold something in common and are willing to rally to the defense of one another.

Are these things virtues to be imitated or vices to be shunned? Are loyalty, generosity, a love of music, art, and literature, a devotion to education, temperance, industry, and ambition things to be hated and condemned in the Jew and others?

The questions do more than answer themselves. They tell us that other races and other groups in America and elsewhere can do few things more profitable than to reflect upon these Jewish traits and cherish them among themselves. Above all, they hold a lesson for Catholic leaders and Catholic educators.

THE PROBLEM OF PAIN

The old objection is often raised that since there is evil in the world, God cannot exist, or He is not good, and this is the same thing as holding that God does not exist. How could a good God permit little children to suffer? But innocent infants do suffer. Therefore, it is sometimes concluded, there is no God.

Aside from the fact that only the complete believer, can offer a genuine answer to the whole objection, a certain retort can be made by anyone to it. If God exists, there must be an explanation for evil, even if we cannot say why He permits it. But if God does not exist, that is, if we accept the objector's conclusion, then there can be no explanation of evil. If the universe is all there is, then the suffering of the helpless infant is simply a brute fact. Nothing else can be in the place of that fact. Suffering simply is and must be, and the objector is completely wrong upon his own principles in saying that it ought not to be. A genuine atheism is a complete monism and in such a doctrine there is no room for a distinction between what ought to be and what ought not to be, i.e., between good and evil. Whatever is is right, and this will include pain and suffering and sin.

"ALL POWER CORRUPTS"

"All power corrupts, and absolute power corrupts absolutely," said Lord Acton. The epigram has been quoted frequently of late and never to my knowledge without approval.

How much truth is in it? Not too much, it must be said. It is not power that corrupts, although there are countless cases in history and in the contemporary scene of men who have misused their great power, of men who have gained great power unjustly, and of men who have not had within themselves the strength to live up to their power.

Mussolini is a case in point. In almost complete control of the Italian nation, he spent his days in debauchery and scheming. He was presented with the clearest opportunity to choose between the peace desired by his people and all the risks of war. In his folly, he chose the war which revealed all the hollowness of his regime. From the high place in history that he might have seized, he fell by an act of his own will to the lowest depths. Was it power or weakness that was the true corrupting cause in his case?

In the case of the German and the Russian leaders it is more correct to say that they exhibit the corruption of power rather than corruption by power. The state should be strong; it should be powerful. But the men who build the state should not deny some power to the other institutions that should likewise be strong, viz., the family and the Church.

What is true, although Acton was not adverting to it, is that the powerful are tempted to place themselves above all moral restrictions. The king, the dictator, and the man of great wealth indulge their vices. The state, or better, the men in control of the state, ignore the rights of the individual. The great company crushes its competitors. The trade union can be as ruthless in its treatment of individuals as can the corporation. It is all a variation on the ancient theme: the assertion that might makes right.

Is not this what Acton's epigram amounts to, if it has a valid meaning? Today as in all ages there are those who think that their power to do a thing with impunity is sufficient right for them to do it. In possession of power they are too weak to withstand the temptation to use their power in selfish and immoral ways. They

sin because they give assent to the ancient sophism that power alone makes things right.

WAR AT ANY PRICE

The words "peace at any price" involve an enormous fallacy. If an individual or a nation pays a wrong price for peace, what results is not peace but slavery and degradation. *Non est pax sed mala voluntas* was a medieval (and perhaps earlier) way of expressing the false peace that results from the triumph of force and injustice. Yet even bad will in the sense of rebellion and hate is better than the wilful acceptance of injustice as the price of peace.

Today's danger is found partly in the acceptance of "peace at any price" as a principle of action. Let us have peace, even at the cost of sacrificing Poland. Let us have peace by appeasing Russia. Let us have peace by forgetting the rights of small and weak nations, of the Baltic States, Finland, Korea, China, and the rest. Let us have peace even if all Europe must be delivered to communism. Let us have peace even at the cost of truth and honor and self-respect. But in the end we too will find that true peace has not been purchased.

Another part of today's danger is summed up in a phrase that has not yet been used, "war at any price." The modern world will not willingly relinquish war. Modern states cling to their "right" to wage war as their dearest possession. Who will forego it? Not Russia, surely. Not England. Not ourselves, for now in the midst of our greatest war, we lay plans to maintain the world's greatest navy, the world's greatest air force, and the world's greatest army. We now prepare to establish ourselves as a militarized nation such as those we have twice defeated because of their militarism. The world in which we live drives us on to this. It is willing to sacrifice nothing for true peace, but it is willing to sacrifice everything for war. "War at any price," at the price of innumerable lives, at the price of religion and culture and civilization, at the price of natural resources and human welfare, this is the maxim that dominates the world today (1945).

JOHN K. RYAN

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

FURTHER REMINISCENCES OF MONEY REFORM

The title of this article, as the careful reader of *The American Ecclesiastical Review* might note, was adapted from Fr. Drinkwater's article in the December, 1950, issue. In that article the author pays some gracious compliments to my recent work, *Catholic Social Principles*. He feels, however, that in a work of such scope some few errors might have intruded. Naturally he is impelled to correct one of these, since it pertains to his own writings.

Fr. Drinkwater was indeed kind in his appraisal of my book. I would hope, but am by no means confident, that its errors are as few as he assumes. In view of the great injustice which he felt was visited upon him, he was more than generous in his private correspondence with me, sending me as he did his later book, *Seven Addresses on Social Justice*, so that I could correct the error.

It was my hope that a careful scrutiny of the later book would permit me to make an *amende honorable* to such a priestly gentleman. But there are passages in the later (1937) sermons which are as disturbing as those in his book issued three years earlier. Undoubtedly the author does not understand them in the extreme sense which this writer takes from them. But, when he repeatedly uses the canonized phraseology of the monetary extremists, some readers at least are going to place him in that category.

My own book lacked clarity if it left the impression that Fr. Drinkwater, or others named, are currently leaders of an active monetary reform school. Actually such movements are unimportant today; they are rather generally depression phenomena. But they have cropped up with such monotonous regularity in the past that another revival, given a depression, would be a reasonable assumption. Likewise, it would not be too much to suppose that such a revived movement would have a noticeable Catholic following. At least the literature of the past century would lead to such a supposition.

It was this probability which impelled me to set down a brief analysis of the more frequent views which crop up in this school. At the same time, a footnote indicated a sampling of Catholic literature espousing some of the views analyzed in the text. The writer meant to convey the impression that no single author neces-

sarily held all these views. Nevertheless, Fathers Drinkwater and Fahey were singled out as extremists. Insofar as Fr. Drinkwater was concerned, this opinion applied only to his monetary theories. His general social and economic writings are generally more moderate, and much more sound, than those of Fr. Fahey.

In Fr. Drinkwater's later book, there is a passage on p. 78 which appears just as extreme as that quoted in *Catholic Social Principles.* He refers to the money question as a forbidden subject. Questions asked in Parliament about the Bank of England's policy will not be answered.

> They know that no daily paper dares to print any real truth about the Money-System, and that if any other sort of journal does it, it will have to suffer for it. They know in fact that the Money-Power is the real Power in this country and can make its displeasure felt just as surely if not as openly as the Dictators can in other countries.

In another passage he refers to using "a money supply that is filthy and foul at its very source with human selfishness and avarice and greed" (p. 16). If these allegations were correct, then silence by the press would have involved a conspiracy to deceive the public.

Again, one of the canonized phrases of the money school is the reference to a "fountain-pen money." It is used in a context indicating that a bank can create money by a mere entry in its books. Fr. Drinkwater uses the phrase in the same sense. He notes that the city of Birmingham had to borrow "from moneylenders who *had* no money to lend really, but who knew the trick of creating money out of nothing with a fountain pen and lending it out at so much percent to mugs like you and me" (p. 15). Elsewhere he is more specific, referring to the "overdrafts granted by the banks to industry; the banks issue as much of it as they think fit, and that imaginary money is our real money" (p. 79).

The banks who normally issue such overdrafts are commercial banks. Hence it is astonishing to read in Fr. Drinkwater's article in *The American Ecclesiastical Review* this passage "I have never blamed anything special on the commercial banks. . . . I have never made any reckless statements about credit-creation . . . nobody was ever able to catch me in any inaccuracy about financial matters . . ." The overdraft system (not generally used in the United States) is a very sensible British method of making loans. Instead

of borrowing at once the total amount needed, and paying interest accordingly, a credit is granted which permits a firm to overdraw its account up to the stated amount and pay interest on the actual amount overdrawn. But it certainly applies primarily if not exclusively to commercial banks.

These pages would hardly be suitable for an analysis of the problem of "fountain-pen money" or credit creation. I have nothing to add to the treatment given in *Catholic Social Principles.* Not all American economists endorse our fractional-reserve system which permits the banking system (as a whole; not any individual bank acting alone) to expand credit. But even this minority of dissenters are poles apart from the "fountain-pen money" thesis. I fear that this dissenting group would consider the term "extremist" an understatement in regard to the money-creation thesis.

To this writer, the espousal of both the theses noted above—the press conspiracy of silence and bank-creation of "fountain-pen money"—would label an author as a monetary extremist. Such views simply are not held by trained economists, whether of the right, left, or center.

As a final point, Fr. Drinkwater's article labels as "plain nonsense" my alleged statement interpreting Pope Pius XI. The Pope, speaking of economic dictatorship, attributes this power particularly to those who control money and credit. I am reputed to have stated that this text applies only to insurance companies. Here is the exact statement of my position, as given on pp. 695 f. of *Catholic Social Principles:*

> The indictment by Pope Pius XI would apply more to the investment-banking system than to the commercial banks attacked by the reformers. Ordinary banks are not permitted here to make capital loans to business. The credit which leads to economic dictatorship is exercised through the flotation of stocks and bonds, not through loans. American writers have treated of "financial empires" which dominate over our economic system, but they normally refer to insurance companies and investment houses, rather than to ordinary banks. Credit creation, in the sense used by Father Drinkwater and others, is not involved. . . .

I go on to state that the fifty billions or more (sixty would be more accurate today) controlled by the life insurance companies through their loans and investments do confer upon them enormous economic power.

Like Fr. Drinkwater, I do not presume to know what the Pope had in mind when writing the passage in question. The Pope did, however, lay down certain general principles which I applied to the United States in the light of 1950 laws and conditions. The type of credit supplied here today by ordinary commercial banks (loans on inventory, on receivable notes, etc.) does not by any remote stretch of the imagination give them dictatorship over economic life. But the control involved in our investment system is something quite different. In the latter case, tens of billions of dollars are at stake, invested in or lent to giant industries. Certainly the papal statement would be much more applicable to this type of credit and money control than it would be to the "dictatorship" exercised by the Tenth National Bank of Podunk Center.

In conclusion, I would like to note my appreciation of the many nne passages, on nonmonetary subjects, in Fr. Drinkwater's book. Would that we had more priests so sensitive to the impassioned pleas of many Popes that we be concerned with the poor and with the social problem. Perhaps I am still unfair in calling his monetary views extreme. But a careful rereading of sources impels me to this hard choice.

JOHN F. CRONIN, S.S.

The National Catholic Welfare Conference
Washington, D. C.

THE CATHOLIC FRATERNITY

We are all brothers, and, for that reason, obligated, not only not to forget and not to betray our brotherhood, but to confess it publicly so as to prevent all forgetfulness and all treason. Alas! Egoism, prejudice, false scrupulosity, and hateful emotions all combine to bring trouble into this, our family, and to loosen the bonds of unity within the Mystical Body of Jesus Christ. It is our right and our duty, and, if we are Christians, it should be our pleasure, to protest, by a solemn act of brotherhood, against all that tends to bring us apart. It should be our pleasure to make the members of that sacred Body of which Jesus Christ is the Head live and live in exuberant spiritual health. Well, the act which protests and manifests the unity of our mystical life to the outside world is our public prayer.

—Father Monsabré, O.P., in *La Prière: Philosophie et théologie de la prière* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1906), pp. 88 f.

INTERROGATION OF THE WOMAN PARTY IN THE *SUPER RATO* PROCESS

Part II

INTERROGATION CONDUCTED BY A PHYSICIAN

Part I of this article considered the office of the judge as the administrator of judicial jurisdiction in executing the act of the process *Super rato* here under discussion. The latter part of this article will deal in the main with some features in respect to the actual conduct of the oral examination of the woman, party in the cause *Super rato*. According to the Decree of the Holy Office of 1942 this deposition must be conducted before the court by a physician with proper moral qualifications, to be selected by the Ordinary; he must be a person beyond all suspicion.[1] However, before discussing the taking of the deposition, a few observations will be offered concerning the question of the juridic position of the physician himself and in regard to the woman deponent.

The physician is not possessed of ecclesiastical jurisdiction, because he is a layman and hence can not enjoy such jurisdiction.[2] He is, therefore, not a judge or one delegated to take the place of the judge. The pertinent paragraph 6 of the Decree of the Holy Office gives no indication of such juridic capacity. In fact, it discloses quite the contrary. Its text clearly distinguishes him from the concept of court or tribunal as such, which, as it was attempted to show in Part I of this article, points to the judge as bearer of judicial jurisdiction. His position does not correspond to that of an *assessor*[3] or to that of an expert *(peritus)*—certainly not in the complete and strict sense—introduced into a canonical procedure;[4] much less to the particular expert employed in the procedure *Super*

[1] "6. Excussio mulieris, quae est pars in causa, paratis ad normam iuris interrogationibus eidem proponendis, semper quidem fiat coram Tribunali, *sed a medico*, qui sit religione, moribus, aetate gravis, ab ipso Ordinario deligendus, omni exceptione maior."—Suprema Sacra Congregatio S. Officii, Decretum, *De quibusdam cautelis adhibendis in causis matrimonialibus impotentiae et inconsummationis*, *AAS*, XXXIV (1942), 201.

[2] Cf. can. 118.

[3] Cf. can. 1575; Roberti, *De processibus*, I, n. 102.

[4] Cf. can. 1792, bf.

rato.[5] His presence at this act of the process is to answer the purpose established by the Decree of 1942; namely, a safeguard to the Christian sense of chastity and propriety.[6]

Though this matter is not mentioned by the Decree of 1942, it seems called for by the general rules of the process that the defender of the bond be consulted preparatory to the selection of the physician.[7] The writer is convinced that upon his appointment the physician should pronounce the oath concerning the faithful execution of his charge and regarding secrecy, required generally of all those who assist the tribunal;[8] for the physician is an instrument of the tribunal.

In due course of the process the woman, petitioner or respondent, will be cited to appear before the court for the oral examination.[9] Though the Decree of 1942 does not so suggest, it would appear proper to include in the citation mention of the fact that the woman will be interrogated by a physician properly identified in the citation. The tribunal may also find it desirable to declare briefly the

[5] If the physician is properly qualified, there is no reason why his services can not be used as of an expert in the procedure *Super rato*, provided that he may be legitimately employed.—Cf. Decree of 1942, §§2, 3, and 5. Finally, if he is, besides, a properly qualified psychiatrist, there is no reason why the tribunal can not enlist his aid as that of an expert in a proper case in which the alleged non-consummation appears to be based on psychological grounds. For the tribunal has at its disposal and resourcesfulness all the means of arriving at the truth.—Cf. Reg. 21, in fine; and by analogy can. 1982, and Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 151. This means, of course, does not obviate the necessity of a canonical physical examination.

[6] Thus, Hickey states, "The questioning of the woman regarding details of intimate marital relations is an extremely delicate one, particularly when the questioning is to be conducted by ecclesiastics. It is no doubt for this reason and to insure a full observance of the norms of Christian modesty *"servatis plene christianae modestiae regulis"* that the Holy Office in its decree *"De quibusdam cautelis adhibendis in causis matrimonialibus impotentiae et inconsummationis,"* has directed that the questioning of the woman be conducted before the court by a physician *"qui sit religione, moribus, aetate gravis . . . omni exceptione maior"* to be appointed by the *Ordinary* himself." —"Requirements of the Ratum et Non Consummatum Process," *The Jurist*, V (1945), 13.

[7] Cf. e.g., Reg. 21 and 87. This procedure seems impliedly indicated by the qualifications of the physician prescribed in paragraph 6 of this Decree, which *inter alia* states: ". . . sed a medico, qui sit . . . omni exceptione maior."

[8] Can. 1621, 1623, §§1, 3; Reg. 19.

[9] Reg. 35-36; Reg. 50.

fundamental reason for the presence of the physician. This information may opportunely be disclosed to her outside the citation also. At all events, it seems to the writer that the deponent is entitled to know this fact and the identity of the physician. The reason for this statement lies in the fact that she is entitled to lodge legitimate exceptions against the person of the one selected.[10] Previous mention will obviate possible surprise and embarrassment. In a case in which the woman is respondent and perhaps guilty in the alleged non-consummation,[11] she may, indeed, be willing to disclose her conduct, but not in the presence of a physician who is an acquaintance or her relative by blood or marriage or that of her husband. Again, the deponent may be willing to submit to the interrogations, but, for some reason or other, not in the presence of a layman, man or woman, even though he is a physician. The court would be constrained to dispense with his services and receive the deposition without him, proper mention of this contingency together with the reason being recorded in the acts.[12] A somewhat similar instance would arise wherein the woman, by reason of her disposition, would find the presence of a male physician very gravely difficult, and thus, at the suggestion of the court or on her own motion, petition the employment of a female physician.[13]

In the following a number of precedural steps will be considered in which the judge will assume an active part in the taking of the deposition.

It is prescribed in the *Regulae servandae* that the judge in the act of placing a person under oath to speak the truth—which is required of all who make a deposition[14]—must administer appropriately an admonition concerning the sanctity of this act and the

[10] The physician is an instrument of the tribunal. His qualifications enumerated in paragraph 6 of the Decree of 1942 by implication admit of the possibility of exceptions against him. Exceptions may be raised against individuals who constitute the personnel of the tribunal.—Cf. by analogy Reg. 16-17; can. 1613-1614; *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, s.v. *Interrogationes generales; op. cit.*, Appendix XXIV, in princ.; Reg. 87; can. 1795, §2.

[11] Cf., also the case envisioned in Reg. 11, §2.

[12] Reg. 99.

[13] Cf. intent of Decree of 1942, §§2-4, especially.

[14] Reg. 39; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 96, §1.

very serious crime of perjury. Specifically, the attention of the deponent must be drawn to the fact that the papal dispensation will be of no avail in the face of the concealed truth of the actual consummation of the marriage in question, and that a subsequent invalid marriage will accordingly result in most serious consequences; finally, it may be deemed opportune to mention the penalty for perjury before the tribunal.[15] To convey such admonitions does not fall within the scope and purpose of the Decree of 1942.[16] Hence, the judge, not the physician, will perform this duty. It may be observed that the physician could be rehearsed, perhaps with some difficulty, in the manner of proposing these admonitions. Yet, as the writer submits, these admonitions are not intended for pro-

[15] Reg. 40; *Regulae servandae*, in princ., Decretum *Catholica doctrina;* can. 1622, §2, 1743, §3; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 96, §2.

[16] As to the nature of a decree of the Sacred Roman Congregations, cf. Schmidt, *The Principles of Authentic Interpretation in Canon 17* (Washington, D. C.: The Catholic University of America Press, 1941), pp. 77-87; especially, pp. 82-87, where the decree is described as an implement of administrative and executive government employed to achieve the spirit and intent of the law. Also, to the same effect, *op. cit.*, pp. 90-103, on the nature and authoritative force of the *Instructio* issued by the Sacred Congregations; Schmidt, "The Juridic Value of the *Instructio* Provided by the Motu Proprio *'Cum Iuris Canonici'* September 15, 1917,"—*The Jurist*, I (1941), 289-316, where the *Instructio* is described as a species of *decreta* (pp. 292, 310), which serve to introduce the spirit of the provisions of the law (pp. 310 ff.). The decree, like the *Instructio*, conveys a practical norm whose direction must be obeyed rather than its literal observance followed (pp. 312 f.). Van Hove thus describes the *Instructio:* "Instructio de se indicat normam simpliciter *declarativam*, cuius directio servanda est potius quam est urgenda litteralis observatio. Personis quibus dirigitur tradit normam agendi, qua gubernari valent et debent, quin tamen legem universalem vel particularem constituat."—*Commentarium Lovaniense in Codicem Iuris Canonici*, Vol. I, Tom. I, *Prolegomena*, 2nd ed., Mechliniae-Romae, 1945), n. 72. The writer believes that this description is applicable to the *decretum* of the SS. Congregations issued pursuant to the *Motu proprio*, "*Cum Iuris Canonici*," Sept. 15, 1917, §II. (This document appears with others at the beginning of the volume of the *Codex Iuris Canonici.*) The writer is furthermore of the opinion that the *decretum* and the *Instructio* which are issued to effectuate the proper observance of existing law (cf. *cit.*, *Motu proprio*, §II) have this in common, that they must be interpreted and followed according to the spirit and purpose for which they are given. Both types of documents represent imperative administrative or executive norms; the *Instructio* is, besides, didactic in character, scil., explaining for practical purposes how the law is to be applied and observed (cf. *cit.*, *Motu proprio*, §II).

posal by the physician, and they would perhaps also be proposed by him with some difficulty. Moreover, their force and gravity would suffer if administered by any other than by the tribunal directly. The party is before the tribunal, and her oath is directed to it. Also upon these considerations it appears to be evident that the oath is to be administered by the judge himself. For it is to be noted that the judge must require the taking of the oath to speak the truth.[17] To exercise this demand is to perform an act of jurisdiction;[18] the performance of the oath is a judicial act.[19] A deponent can freely counter with a refusal to take this oath tendered by anyone except by the judge as bearer of judicial jurisdiction, or by one who is lawfully deputed to take his place. In this latter contingency the reason for this refusal must be recorded in the acts.[20] Only the judge has the authority to call the deponent to account for the reason of such refusal.[21]

Immediately following the oath the so-called general interrogations are proposed to the party.[22] They refer to identity and general conditions and circumstances and are uniform for all deponents.[23] Hence there is contained in them nothing which falls within the defined purpose of the Decree of 1942. For this reason the general questions will be proposed by the judge. But there are in this matter also practical considerations in favor of such procedure. At this point of the hearing it is necessary to establish the identity of the party before the tribunal. It is not in order here to enter into detail concerning this precaution.[24] However, it may be noticed in general, that the physician would hardly be expected, upon both legal and practical grounds, to be capable of taking cognizance of this procedural act, which has, moreover, no peculiar

[17] Reg. 39; can. 1744.

[18] "Quare quae iudex decernit aut ordinat, vera iussa faciunt quibus parere necesse est; ac inobedientes fiunt contumaces."—*Regulae servandae*, in princ., Decretum, *Catholica doctrina*.

[19] Can. 1622, §3, 1318, §1; Lega-Bartoccetti, *Commentarius in iudicia ecclesiastica* (Romae, 1938), I, 241, n. 3, pp. 242-43, n. 7-8.

[20] Reg. 39.

[21] Can. 1742, §1, 1743, §§-3.

[22] Cf. *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX.

[23] Reg. 42.

[24] Cf. *Normae observandae in processibus super matrimonio rato et non consummato ad praecavendam dolosam personarum substitutionem*, *AAS*, XXI (1929), 490.

reference to the specific deposition of the woman; for the requirement is applicable to all who make a deposition.[25] In a given case, however, the physician may be deemed by the court to be in a position to serve in establishing the identity by reason of his personal acquaintance with the party, especially when better proof is not obtainable.[26] Likewise, in connection with the general interrogations concerning the person of the deponent, it may be found necessary in a certain case, in which, namely, the tribunal can not obtain information concerning the probity and credibility of the party through the usual channels,[27] to make inquiry directly of the party deponent to furnish names of reliable persons known to the tribunal, who have been well acquainted with her. The situation may well arise if the party is a non-Catholic. On the other hand, the physician may, perhaps, here also be able to aid the tribunal.[28] The judge himself would directly conduct such inquiry.

After the general interrogations, the judge, inasmuch as the particular case may so warrant must address himself to the party before the court in an endeavor to effect a marital reconciliation, together with an inquiry into the causes which hinder reconciliation in an attempt to remove them.[29] The nature and purpose of this overture need not draw the judge into a discussion with the party concerning intimate details of conjugal relation, which is to be avoided by him, and which, in fact, at this point of the interrogation may only cause confusion and needless repetition later. In a given instance, indeed, such details may be brought forward in the response by the party. In that event the court can discretely refer them and the obstacles to reconciliation which they present to the particular interrogations to be made by the physician, or deal with them by way of additional questions pertinent to the stage of particular interrogations. Moreover, where such details are foreseen to arise in a given case,[30] they can be dealt with upon the question of reconciliation among the particular questions in the interrogatory

[25] *Normae observandae*, 1, §1, 2-3; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 97.

[26] *Normae observandae*, 1, §3.

[27] Reg. 25; Cf. *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, in fine.

[28] Cf., *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIV.

[29] Cf. *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, in princ.; *op. cit.*, in princ., Appendix M. Cardinalis Lega ad Decretum *Catholica doctrina*.

[30] Cf. Reg. 10, concerning discovery of facts in the preliminary investigation, and attempt by the Ordinary and pastor to effect reconciliation.

composed by the defender of the bond. On his part, the judge can, and must, attempt to obviate the causes of estrangement and to bring about reconciliation at any point of the process, if there is reason to hope for a successful result. In particular, the practical consideration here is that the proffer of reconciliation seems by the language of the *Regulae servandae* to be intended as initiated by and coming directly from ecclesiastical authority and pastoral solicitude[31]—a matter which, therefore, hardly seems to lend itself to a preconceived formula of words or of questions to be read and proposed by the physician to the party deponent.

The particular interrogations, as they are called, are now proposed; they have specific reference to the particular case. As an introduction to these questions, the judge may deem it opportune to have her petition read to the party deponent; this act supposes, of course, that she is the petitioner. Concerning the petition, the judge asks, besides other introductory questions in respect to this item, whether or not she confirms the petition in all its parts.[32]

It is at this point of the interrogation that the judge must then instruct the party to reply to the questions to be proposed to her by the physician. As already intimated, to direct the party in this manner requires an act of jurisdiction which only the judge can perform, because the party has otherwise no obligation to respond to the inquiries of anyone except those of the judge. For the reasons stated in the foregoing, it is submitted that the intent and purpose of paragraph 6 of the Decree of 1942 as indicated by its own language, refer only to the particular interrogations prepared in respect to the specific case, and all additional questions pertinent thereto, of course. It is, moreover, only these questions which have direct reference to the cause in question, and which the defender of the bond delivers to the judge in the act of oral examination.[33] As previously indicated, however, the judge must in general be attentive to the course of the interrogation and in particular to a number of items to be suggested in the following.

Toward the close of the interrogatory, the question of naming *septimae manus* witnesses and other material witnesses occurs.[34]

[31] Cf. Reg. 10; *Regulae servandae*, Decretum *Catholica doctrina*, Appendix M. Cardinalis Lega; *op. cit.*, Appendix II and III.

[32] Cf. *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, 2.

[33] Cf. Reg. 28; can. 1968, 1°; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 101.

[34] Reg. 57; *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, 22.

It is important that the judge take care that the party name seven *septimae manus* witnesses, or otherwise that the reason be stated in the acts as to why only fewer names have been submitted.[35] Perhaps the party can not name seven such witnesses. It is also of practical import to observe that the party should not be permitted to omit stating—among other details pertinent to the person and whereabouts of the witnesses—what facts these witnesses are severally able to testify to.[36] In this matter special attention must be given to the case in which the other party has been found contumacious,[37] or whose testimony is otherwise unavailable to the tribunal.[38] Similar attention should be paid by the judge to the question in regard to documents.[39] The question in respect to the consent of the party to submit to a physical examination and its incidents may have been presented to her informally outside of court. Yet these matters must appear formally in the acts.[40] In a given case, however, e.g., one in which the woman has to be heard by means of a rogatory commission, the tribunal may not have been able to inform itself of the party's attitude and condition in respect to the question. But in any event, there is no doubt that the judge, without entering upon a discussion directly with the party concerning her physical condition and the reasons for her refusal, perchance, to submit to such examination—since these matters can be obviated by questions previously prepared by the defender of the bond—must then and there see to it that a complete pertinent account of the party's position is included in the

[35] Reg. 59.

[36] Cf. *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, 18 and 22; can. 1761, §1; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 125. In this regard Hickey states, "Finally, when the testimony of the parties discloses the manifestation by them to others of the failure or inability to exercise conjugal relations, it is important for the purpose of the inquiry to determine whether this manifestation occurred *"tempore non suspecto"* and thus whether there exist any informed witnesses. Hence, when this occurs, the parties should always be requested to state when, and to whom, and under what circumstances this manifestation took place," citing Reg. 60, §2 and Reg. 42.—"Requirements of the Ratum et Non Consummatum Process"—*The Jurist*, V (1945), 13; see also the following page 14.

[37] Cf. Reg. 57, §2.

[38] *Regulae servandae*, Appendix XIX, 23.

[39] Cf. *op. cit.*, Appendix XIX, 24; Reg. 76.

[40] *Op. cit.*, Appendix XIX, 25.

acts, especially in view of the Decree of 1942, paragraphs 1-4.[41] In case of reluctance or refusal, the judge may be able, without urging or insisting upon compliance, to dispose the party as favorable to the physical examination, either personally or through the good offices of the Bishop, who should at all events be informed of the party's unfavorable attitude or refusal.[42] In the case of refusal to be examined by experts, it may also be observed that the party must be advised of the very serious difficulty or even the probable impossibility of obtaining sufficient proof of the alleged non-consummation, because of this refusal.[43]

The direct oral examination based upon the particular interrogations proposed by the agency of the physician will now have been completed. His services, however, may still be needed. For, as previously indicated, it may be necessary at this point, because of serious discrepancy between the depositions of the two parties, for the judge to cause new questions to be proposed to the present party,[44] for the purpose of clarifying this difficulty.[45] To accomplish this purpose adequately, the judge may deem it advisable to declare a recess or adjournment of the session of court.[46] In the interim consultation with the defender of the bond may be had, the proper questions prepared, and the physician properly instructed. Aside from this contingency, however, it seems called for, after the completion of the direct examination of the party by the series of particular interrogations, that the judge have read to the present party, in this instance, the respondent, the text of the petition of the petitioner, with the inquiry, subjoined by the judge, as to whether or not she agrees with the individual items alleged therein.[47] Thereafter, the judge may also find it opportune to entertain any motions by way of additional petitions from the party deponent in regard to obtaining any further evidence or the performance of any other procedural act.[48] Questioning on these

[41] Cf. also Reg. 89.

[42] Cf. Reg. 100.

[43] Decree of 1942, §4.

[44] Cf. *op. cit.*, Appendix XXIV.

[45] Reg. 55; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 114.

[46] Cf. *op. cit.*, Appendix XIX, in fine; Reg. 33. It seems necessary to require the oath of secrecy from the party leaving the tribunal.—Reg. 46.

[47] Cf. Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 113; Reg. 50.

[48] Cf. Reg. 22; Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 114, §1; can. 1745, §1.

subjects, if pertaining to the particulars in the deposition of the party, is reserved to the physician.

The deposition of the party will be concluded by the re-reading of its contents, with the usual liberty to the party to add and amend, together with the observance of the usual final procedural steps at the direction of the judge;[49] any further questioning of the party on the addition to or amendment of the deposition concerning the particular interrogations is to be conducted by the physician at the direction of the judge and the consultation of the defender of the bond, if the latter intervenes, and in the manner, if necessary, as suggested in the foregoing.

One final question may be entertained here. May the judge, after consultation with the defender of the bond, allow the physician chosen to peruse prior to the actual hearing the questions which he is to propose, and at the same occasion instruct him concerning the general procedure? It is submitted, as the opinion of the writer, that such information is entirely in order,[50] provided that the physician has pronounced the oath in regard to the faithful fulfillment of his appointment and to secrecy.[51] For it seems proper that the physician should, to some extent at least, be antecedently informed concerning the character of his task. By the same token, the judge, after consultation with the defender of the bond, by reason of practical considerations, may deem it proper to permit the physician to familiarize himself with the contents of the petition in the cause. The physician should, of course, not be permitted to retain a copy of the petition or of the questions. And if the judge deems it opportune, the physician must be advised that such preliminary information must remain entirely confidential[52] under the requirements of his oath. Any disagreement in this matter can readily be expedited by recourse to the Bishop.

In view of the foregoing considerations proposed in this article, the following conclusion is summarized as the intendment of paragraph 6 of the Decree of 1942 in respect to the subjects here dis-

[49] Reg. 46; cf. *op. cit.*, Appendix XIX, 26-27, and in fine.

[50] Cf. the intent of can. 1799, §1, and Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 147, §§1-2, which is to have the expert informed in respect to the charge which he is to execute.

[51] Cf. can. 1797, §1.

[52] Cf. intent of Instr. *Provida Mater*, Art. 103, §1, a.

cussed, as governing the interrogation of the woman, party in the cause *Super rato*. All those matters whose content pertains to that of the particular interrogations lie to the questioning to be executed by the physician before the court. All matters referring to the general interrogations and to subjects of uniform content and import applicable to all deponents before the tribunal, such as oaths and general instructions, belong to the judge personally and directly to propose. The judge does not personally enter into a questioning of the party on matters whose content is pertinent to subjects of the particular interrogations and respective answers of the party.

JOHN R. SCHMIDT

The Catholic University of America
Washington, D. C.

TEMPORAL PROSPERITY IN THE DIVINE PLAN

Do we know what it really is, this temporal prosperity which is the object of so much vulgar desire? Much of the time it is a mystery which God uses to hide the most terrible of His judgments from human eyes. God is bound to punish the man who wearies His admirable patience by proud impiety and unrepentant immorality. God knows that this rebellious soul will gain nothing from the severe lessons of His justice, and that suffering will never extinguish in this perverse heart the horrible affection for sin, and that this obstinate sinner will only answer the last and merciful advances of God with impenitence. Then God looks to see if there has been, in this wicked life, some good action which can be brought to His attention on the day of judgment, and which might disturb the eternal action of His sentence. That good act, without merit for heaven, God rewards today with temporal prosperity.

—Father Monsabré, in *La Prière: Philosophie et théologie de la prière* (Paris: Lethielleux, 1906), pp. 276 f.

Answers to Questions

THE PROBLEM OF A NATIONAL LOTTERY

Question 1: Would it be in accord with the divine law for a nation to hold a lottery under governmental supervision, the proceeds being used for charitable purposes?

Question 2: In the United States, would there seem to be any reasonable objection to the conducting of such a lottery under the jurisdiction of the Post Office Department?

Answer 1: From the standpoint of the divine law there is no objection to a governmental lottery for the raising of funds for a good purpose, such as the assistance of charitable institutions. Of course, the supposition is that the conditions required for a lawful aleatory contract will be observed. These conditions, developed at length by moral theologians, require that perfect honesty be observed, that there be a reasonable proportion observed between the amount which a person contributes and the expectation of the prize or prizes—although a generous interpretation of this condition is allowed when the proceeds of the lottery are for public charity (cf. Merkelbach, *Summa theologiae moralis* [Paris, 1938], 2, n. 602)—and that there be effective restrictions to prevent people from unduly squandering their money.

Answer 2: The method which the questioner proposes for a lottery in our country, supposing that it be authorized by the government, would seem to be well adapted to insure the proper conducting of such a means of raising funds. As we all know, it is difficult to keep dishonesty out of any of the institutions of our public life. But the placing of such a project under the jurisdiction of the Post Office would appear to offer as good a chance of honest procedure as any that could be proposed.

CONFIRMATION OF A NON-CATHOLIC

Question: May a pastor within the limits of his parish ever administer the sacrament of Confirmation to a dying non-Catholic?

Answer: The questioner is evidently referring to the use by a pastor of a faculty granted by the Holy See through the Sacred Congregation of the Discipline of the Sacraments on Sept. 14, 1946 (effective from Jan. 1, 1947), whereby a pastor within the limits of his parish may administer Confirmation to a person in danger of death, who has not received this sacrament, provided that the services of a Bishop are not available (*AAS,* 38 [1946], 349 f.). The decree of the Sacred Congregation evidently visualized only Catholics as the recipients of this extraordinary privilege; but in view of the fact that in recent years a considerable number of reliable theologians have upheld the opinion that a non-Catholic, when unconscious and in danger of death, may be granted conditionally the sacraments of Baptism (unless it is certain that he has been validly baptized), Penance and Extreme Unction (cf. Kilker, *Extreme Unction* [St. Louis, 1927], 123 ff.), at least when he is known to have been sincere in the profession of the Christian faith, the question may suitably be asked if this generous interpretation of Church legislation (Can. 731, § 2; 752, § 1) may be extended to the sacrament of Confirmation.

When there is question of confirming the infant child of non-Catholics that is surely dying there would seem to be no difficulty, presuming that the danger of scandal and other objectional consequences can be avoided. For such a child, when baptized, can certainly receive Confirmation validly and fruitfully, just like the child of Catholic parents. However, when there is question of confirming an adult non-Catholic we encounter a difficulty from the standpoint of his intention. For, while it is frequently reasonable to presume that such a person has the intention of receiving those sacraments which are *necessary* for salvation, the same presumption does not exist in respect to the intention to receive a sacrament that is not necessary for the attainment of eternal salvation. Now, Confirmation is not necessary for salvation, either by necessity of means or (probably) by necessity of precept.

On the other hand, Confirmation is very beneficial to the soul in that it confers a great increase of grace in the present life with a title to additional glory in the life to come. Hence, there are undoubtedly some devout non-Catholics who have the intention of receiving this sacrament included in their will to partake of any spiritual means which God may have established to give them an

increased measure of grace and of glory. In conformity with the theological opinion mentioned above, it would seem justifiable for a pastor to confirm a non-Catholic possessing such dispositions when he is unconscious and in danger of death.

Therefore, while a priest may not be as liberal in respect to the administration of Confirmation as in respect to the administration of Baptism, Penance, and Extreme Unction, it would seem that in extraordinary circumstances he would be justified in giving Confirmation also to a non-Catholic who is unconscious and is evidently near death. Such a case would occur if the priest personally knows that the individual in question is a sincerely devout Christian, eager to make use of all the means God has provided for conferring an increase of holiness. On such a person a priest endowed with the requisite power might confer Confirmation. It must be emphasized that great prudence is to be exercised in such a case, so that no scandal may result and no opprobrium may be inflicted on the Church.

THE ENDURANCE OF PRECEPTS IN A RELIGIOUS ORDER

Question 1: If the superior general of an exempt clerical religious Order, in which only the General Definitorium is empowered to make laws, imposes on all the members a command by virtue of obedience, does this ruling bind the members after his term of office is ended?

Question 2: Do the precepts of a Visitor to a religious community continue in force after the expiration of the administration which deputed him?

Answer 1: Undoubtedly the superior general of an exempt clerical religious Order, being endowed with jurisdictional power, has the right to impose precepts *on individual members* which will endure after the termination of his office, provided they are imposed through a legitimate document or before two witnesses (Can. 24). But when he promulgates a regulation binding on *the entire Order* it can surely be reasonably presumed that he intends to use only his dominative power—at least in the case of an Order in which only the General Definitorium may legislate—since a command to the entire Order by virtue of jurisdictional authority

would be equivalent to a law. Now, according to the more common opinion of the canonists (cf. Coronata, *Institutiones Juris Canonici* [Turin, 1939], 1, n. 32), the right to impose a precept that will perdure after the term of office of the authority who imposes it (Can. 24) can be exercised only in virtue of jurisdictional power. Hence, in the case presented it would seem that the rulings in question expire with the expiration of the term of office of the Superior General.

Answer 2: The same principles are applicable in reference to a Visitor in an Order of this nature. He can surely be endowed with jurisdictional power by the Superior General and accordingly can impose precepts on individuals, and probably on individual communities (cf. Cicognani, *Canon Law* [Westminster, Md., 1934], p. 638), which will endure permanently, as long as they are invested with the formalities described in Can. 24. But, unless he expressly states that he is using jurisdictional power or that he intends these rulings to continue indefinitely, it seems reasonable to conclude that only dominative authority is being employed, so that such precepts can be considered as no longer binding after the passing of the administration which deputed him as Visitor (cf. Peska, *Jus sacrum Congregationis SS. Redemptoris* [Prague, 1923], n. 298).

FRANCIS J. CONNELL, C.SS.R.

WASHING THE CELEBRANT'S HANDS

Question: (a) Is it correct for the altar boy to present at the lavabo a bowl already filled with water? (b) Does the celebrant wash all the fingers?

Answer: (a) The authors all direct that the altar boy pour water over the fingers of the celebrant while he stands at the epistle corner of the altar reciting the twenty-fifth psalm. No mention is made of presenting a bowl already filled with water.

(b) Again the liturgical authorities instruct the altar boy to pour the water over the tips of the thumbs and index fingers of both hands of the celebrant.

MISSA RECITATA

Question: Is a pastor free to decide on what days he would find it best to have his parishioners have the Dialogue Mass or *Missa Recitata*? What responses do the people make? There seems to be confusion here on that point.

Answer: A pastor is free to have the *Missa Recitata* on whatever day or days he selects; provided, however, that he has the express permission of the Ordinary. The faithful may recite aloud the prayers ordinarily said by the altar boy. In addition they may say together with the celebrant the Gloria, the Credo, the Sanctus, and the Agnus Dei. If Holy Communion is distributed they recite with the priest the *Domine non sum dignus* when he turns toward the people with the ciborium in his hand. The faithful may not recite any other prayers of the Mass aloud and the prayers are never said in any language other than Latin.

ONE SERVER FOR TWO MASSES

Question: I am stationed at an institution where it is difficult to secure servers. Is it permissible to have the server for the priest offering Mass at the adjoining altar make the responses for me when it is convenient to do so?

Answer: Fr. Mahoney in discussing a similar case says this is permissible when there is a real necessity and one is forced to make the choice of the lesser of two evils. *L'Ami du Clergé* (1912, p. 1072) tells us that in the absence of a server the one making the responses at an adjoining altar should give whatever assistance he can to the priest at the other altar.

PURIFYING THE COMMUNION PLATE

Question: When a priest is binating, after the distribution of Holy Communion does he purify the communion plate into the ciborium or into the chalice that he has used in offering Holy Mass?

Answer: All the books on ceremonies tell us that the communion plate is purified into the chalice when Holy Communion is distributed during Mass. The same is true when another Mass offered by

the same priest is to follow. The fact of bination does not alter the procedure. Only when Holy Communion is distributed outside of Mass does the priest purify the paten in the ciborium.

LOSS OF CONSECRATION OR BLESSING

Question: In our sacristy we have an old chalice that I feel is not fit to use. One of the other priests disagrees with me. What determines the loss of consecration? If the chalice is regilded or replated must it be consecrated again?

Answer: Canon Law tells us that sacred vessels or articles lose their consecration or blessing if they undergo such damage or change that make them unsuited for their original purpose. Likewise, if they are used for unbecoming purposes or are offered for public sale.

A chalice need not be reconsecrated after it has been regilded or replated. However, since there is a grave obligation to see that chalices are kept in good condition, the regilding should be done by very reliable firms and business people endorsed by the chancery office.

THE *CUSTODIA*

Question: Are we obliged to have a *custodia* for the lunette? If so is it required to cover the *custodia* with a veil?

Answer: The *custodia*, a small receptacle for the lunette, is necessary and required if the lunette is not enclosed between two round pieces of glass or crystal. No specific mention is made by authors regarding a veil for the *custodia*. However, indirectly, its use is implied and urged by the same principle employed for the ciborium.

A ROSARY MEDAL

Question: During the recent months we have seen a medal with the image of the Blessed Virgin on one side and a cross on the reverse side. The edge of the medal with the image of Our Lady had fifteen small balls like knots to indicate the beads of the rosary. Could this be blessed and used for a rosary?

Answer: We do not see how this medal would satisfy for a rosary. First, it is not a corona but merely a means to help one count the number of times he recites the *Paters* and *Aves* of the rosary. Secondly, such a medal would necessarily require an ecclesiastical approval before it could be blessed.

DISTRIBUTION OF HOLY COMMUNION BY A DEACON

Question: At Christmas time I had a deacon seminarian distribute Holy Communion outside of Mass. Was I as pastor within my rights in granting this permission? Was the deacon correct in following the same ceremony as the priest?

Answer: Fr. Lawrence O'Connell states that "a deacon may administer Holy Communion with the permission of the Ordinary or the pastor, but there must be a grave reason for permitting him to do so. In case of necessity, permission can be presumed."

When a deacon does distribute Holy Communion outside of Mass he follows all the rubrics observed by the priest except that he wears the stole deacon fashion. He even imparts the blessing after he has finished administering Holy Communion.

WEARING THE MITRE DURING THE SINGING OF "ET INCARNATUS EST"

Question: Our auxiliary Bishop pontificated at midnight Mass. I was on for ceremonies with him and I noted with some strangeness that as he knelt during the *et incarnatus est* of the Credo he retained his miter. Was he correct in retaining the miter?

Answer: While the wearing of the miter at this particular ceremony seems to indicate a lack of reverence and adoration, nevertheless the best authorities on pontifical ceremonies, Martinucci and Le Vavasseur, specifically direct the Bishop to retain his miter.

PREACHING IN *FERRAIOLO*

Question: May a simple priest, one who is not a member of the papal household, wear the *ferraiolo* when preaching?

Answer: The black *ferraiolo* for priests and violet for bishops and domestic prelates should be worn over the cassock on occasions of a formal but non-liturgical character. Hence, it is the fitting and proper dress at solemn functions like academic affairs, commencements, and receptions.

The proper dress for preaching is cassock and surplice. The stole is not required but may be worn. However, the one preaching at a Funeral Mass may wear the *ferraiolo* over the cassock but never a surplice and black stole.

MIXED MARRIAGES IN CHURCH

Question: What is the proper dress for a priest performing a mixed marriage in church or sacristy or rectory? After talking to various priests I find no uniformity among them on this point.

Answer: One is bound to follow the diocesan regulations and the prescriptions set down by the local Ordinary as regards the proper dress for mixed marriages. We generally find for marriages taking place in the rectory or in the sacristy, priests wear either their civilian (street) clothes or the cassock without surplice. In localities where mixed marriages are performed in church at the communion railing or at a side altar, many of the priests wear cassock and surplice but no stole.

WALTER J. SCHMITZ, S.S.

If we inquire into the kind of life men lead everywhere, it is impossible for anyone to avoid the conclusion that public and private morals differ vastly from the precepts of the Gospel. Too sadly, alas! do the words of the apostle St. John apply to our age: All that is in the world is the concupiscence of the flesh, and the concupiscence of the eyes, and the pride of life. For in truth most men, with little heed as to whence they have come or whither they are going, place all their thoughts and all their care upon the vain and fleeting goods of this life; and, contrary to nature and right order, they voluntarily give themselves up to serve things of which their reason tells them they should be the masters.

—Leo XIII, "The Right Ordering of Christian Life," in *The Great Encyclical Letters of Pope Leo XIII* (New York: Benziger, 1903), p. 166.

Book Reviews

FIFTY YEARS OF THE AMERICAN NOVEL: A CHRISTIAN APPRAISAL. Edited by H. C. Gardiner, S.J. New York: Scribner's, 1951. Pp. 304. $3.00.

Fr. Simons, in his essay "Grace before Reading," attempts to make his readers aware that reading has a bearing on the formation of character and influences the direction of our souls. A reader, aware of such influences, must experiment for himself to discover which books are harmful to him. Among our growing Catholics such a method can lead to disastrous results because of the gradual loss of belief in supernatural values. The alternative is to put at the disposal of readers such books as this symposium, which seeks to make an "evaluation of such a nature that the prospective reader is able to divine whether the particular author, with *his* subject-matter, and *his* treatment, can prudently be read without jeopardizing a greater good" (p. x).

This symposium consists of sixteen essays. Fourteen of them are devoted to individual American authors who have been influential on the development of the novel since 1900. There is a supplementary essay on the novelists of World War II. It can only be expected that some looked-for names are missing; yet it would be difficult to pick a better-balanced list of important American novelists. Its real weakness is rather that it devotes too much space to writers whose influence, outside of writing courses, has waned. In view of the purposes of this book, a deeper analysis of the work of the war novelists and those writing since then would make it more valuable. This is evident to anyone familiar with the popularity of the titles of these writers on the pocket-book stands, and on the lists of required readings of high schools and colleges.

Fr. Gardiner and his associates have done an excellent piece of work. They discuss the philosophy of the novelists considered with a competence which is obvious. However, the deeper value of this work lies in the insights into a philosophy of literature which these men give as they build a basis for their criticism. In particular, Fr. Gardiner's introductory essay "A Christian Appraisal" can be studied by all who are interested in forming principles of Christian literary criticism. However, he shows a surprising weakness in his use of the word "religious"; it seems to have lost all meaning. He also indulges in a

coyness of style that is regrettable. Apparently he feels on the defensive about his work. There is no need to be. Among the essays, Sandeen on Faulkner, Fr. Kennedy on Steinbeck, and C. C. Hollis on Sinclair Lewis are good. Michael Moloney writes well on Hemingway, but it is time a more exact word than "naturalism" were found to explain the rather obvious neuroses influencing such writers as Hemingway. Herbert McLuhan's essay on Dos Passos is an excellent piece of work but there is no essay in the book which comes off so well as Charles Brady's on John Marquand.

The priest who is trying to guide the reading of his parishioners will find here an adequate and sound appraisal of the philosophy of man as he is seen by the American authors widely read today. Moreover, he will find in it excellent principles to use in judging the work of other writers.

JOHN P. MCMANUS, S.S.

FATHER PAUL OF GRAYMOOR. By Rev. David Gannon, S.A. Foreword by Francis Cardinal Spellman. New York: Macmillan and Co. Pp. x + 372. $4.00.

This biography of Father Paul James Francis, S.A., founder of the Society of the Atonement and of numerous apostolic works, forms an interesting and valuable chapter in the history of the Catholic Church in America. The spiritual saga of Father Paul, his projects and achievements, his dreams and their fulfillment, as well as his sorrows, his disappointments, and crosses reads almost like a legend from the distant past, as though a Francis of Assisi had lived in our age.

However, the story is far from being legendary. It is the factual account of a man who sought to follow Our Lord after the pattern of the Poverello of Assisi. It is an odyssey which begins in the Anglican body and here continues for forty-six years until his reception into the Church; its Catholic phase lasted thirty-one years until Father Paul's sudden death in 1940. But in these seventy-seven years was crowded an amazing career, unusual in the annals of the Church in America, and perhaps in the whole history of the Church.

The author has well depicted this extraordinary man. He has shown the first stirrings of a vocation at the age of ten years; the period of the Anglican ministry; the desire to found a religious community; the unusual circumstances in securing the name Atonement; the entrance into the Fold of Peter in 1909 and the ordination to the holy

priesthood the following year. Father David has traced the beginnings and the development of various works, started in the days of Anglicanism and allowed to continue under Catholic jurisdiction. He has indicated that the life of Father Paul is like a high romance, wherein God gave him the energy and the grace to perform great deeds.

Father Paul was especially prominent in his devotion to the Holy See. He loved the papacy, and his loyalty to it even as a non-Catholic was outstanding. Indeed Cardinal Spellman has remarked in the foreword that "Father Paul was a convert to the Catholic religion. And yet, as one reads the account of his life, one wonders whether he was anything else but a Catholic at heart even before his conversion" (p. vii). We might ask how he could remain outside the Church for so long a time—about ten years—while constantly and courageously preaching the necessity of the return of all non-Catholics to the Holy Father, the supreme and infallible head of the Church. But if one understands the attitude (though not the position) of the so-called Anglo-Catholics who await a kind of mass conversion and remain Anglicans all the while, then he will realize the situation of Father Paul during this period.

This eminent convert always declared that he never acted against his conscience in the matter of entering the Church and so the delay must be left to the Providence of God and the mystery of grace. But so far as we may judge the motives of Father Paul it seems that the last chain which bound him to the Anglican communion was the hope that the decree on Anglican orders might be reversed. But this was broken and he entered the Church which he had so earnestly defended. He brought with him sixteen others, one friar, five sisters, and ten layfolk. Thus the opinion that the Society of the Atonement was a large, thriving community prior to its reception into the Church is contrary to the facts.

Of particular interest is the chapter dealing with Blessed Pius X. This holy Pontiff, recently raised to the altars, allowed the Society to enter the Church and retain its name, the religious habit, the vocation of unity, and the projects, some of which at the time were little more than ideas and dreams.

Chief among the works which Father Paul started were the Union-That-Nothing-Be-Lost, a society to assist missionaries at home and in the foreign field; the Rosary League of Our Lady of the Atonement, to spread devotion to the Mother of God; the apostolate of the poor which was concretized in the erection of St. Christopher's Inn; the publication of *The Lamp* as an organ of Christian Unity. These projects flourished in the Catholic years and Father Paul also became co-

founder of the Near East Welfare Association (1926) and began the *Ave Maria Hour* (1935), a radio program which has since spread to more than four hundred stations. He was likewise the spiritual father and founder of the Sisters of the Atonement, a companion community to the friars, whose foundress was Mother Mary Lurana Francis, S.A. and whose motherhouse is also at Graymoor.

But of all the works bearing the blessing of God and the imprint of the spiritual genius of Father Paul none is greater than the Chair of Unity Octave. Next to founding the Society, this was the most singular accomplishment. He might be called a great religious leader, an eminent preacher, a close imitator of St. Francis (he did not touch money for forty years), a magnificant priest, but the title that seems most to identify his character is that which has been given by many others: "An Apostle of Unity." One priest has said that "Unity was the consuming passion of Father Paul's life" and several cardinals have eulogized his efforts in the unionistic field. He was indefatigable in promoting the Octave and in helping to bring souls into the Church. The Octave's simple beginning at Graymoor in 1908 is another example of the mustard seed becoming a tree.

The splendid and poised foreword by Cardinal Spellman is a worthy tribute to Father Paul. His Eminence writes of him as another illustrious Franciscan whose name may be justly added to the list of Le Curon, Hennepin, and Serra. "He was a pioneer in a specific field—the Reunion of Christendom. Father Paul in this our day, was a reflection of the poor man of Assisi—Saint Francis, the Saint of Unity" (p. x). A complete index and a number of photographic illustrations add to the value of the volume. It is to be highly recommended and should awaken its readers to the greatness of Father Paul and of his vocation of Unity. It is a compliment to Father Paul and to the author that the work has been used as refectory reading in many religious houses throughout the country.

In my own observation it seems that the chapter dealing with our Blessed Mother as Our Lady of the Atonement (p. 327 ff.) might include more of Father Paul's concept of Mary under this title. He said that this name meant "Our Lady of Unity" for she would have a vital role to play in the Ato-one-ment or unity of all men with Christ. It may further be remarked that Father Paul's great love of the Holy See is a welcome reaction to some (as it seems to me) shallow and imprudent writings at the present time in regard to the papacy and the power and authority of the Pope, even from Catholic pens.

The story of *Father Paul of Graymoor* is another answer to the prayer of Christ on the night of Holy Thursday "That they all may be one." May it in turn lead others to Christ, giving Catholics a greater